

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management.

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Chairman.*
W. E. P. FANTIN, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.* E. HARRISON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*
Prof. J. P. DOBSON, M.A. *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.* Prof. A. C. CLARK, M.A. *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.R.A., F.R.S.L. Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., &c.D., LL.D., F.R.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.C., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXIX

NOVEMBER, 1915

No. 7

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
Oeana in Hesiod. T. L. AGAR	193	Elliott's <i>Acharnians</i> of Aristophanes. A. S. F. GOW	212
A Note on the Word Accent in Greek Music. R. L. TURNER	195	Bitram's <i>Opferkreis und Vorkreis der Griechen und Römer</i> . J. T. SHEPPARD	214
On an Archaic Thessalian Epigram. MARCUS N. TOD	196	Murray's <i>Alcestis</i> of Euripides. G. P.	216
Catullus, LXXIV. E. HARRISON	198	Conway and Walters's <i>Text of Livy 1-5</i> . A. SOUTER	217
Horace and the Scholia. A. J. BELL	199		
NOTES:		SHORT NOTICES:	
Sophocles, <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i> , l. 1219. A. E. ROHR	203	Cheesman's <i>Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army</i> . F. HAVERFIELD	218
On the Derivation of <i>Famulus</i> , <i>Familia</i> . F. A. WRIGHT	204	Pohlenz's <i>Ans Platons Werdegang</i> . MARIE V. WILLIAMS	219
REVIEWS:		On Isidore, VIII. xi. § 83. SAMUEL ALLEN	220
Pickard-Cambridge's <i>Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom</i> . D. H. T. RICHBIETH	204	Bury's <i>History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great</i> . Σ	220
Jacoby's <i>Herodotos: Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie</i>	207	OBITUARIES	221
Leach's <i>Schools of Mediaeval England</i> . FRANK GRANGER	210	CORRESPONDENCE	223
		BOOKS RECEIVED	224

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

WHERE TO BUY YOUR BOOKS

JUST ISSUED

A Catalogue of Miscellaneous SECOND-HAND BOOKS

Together with a small collection of
Naval and Military Literature, in-
cluding many Regimental Records

HATCHARDS
187, PICCADILLY, LONDON, W.

BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C.

A. & F. DENNY

BOOKSELLERS
AND
BOOKBINDERS

147, Strand, London, W.C.

(OPPOSITE GAIETY THEATRE)

THE PLACE-NAMES OF ENGLAND AND WALES

By the Rev. JAMES B. JOHNSTON,
M.A., B.D., Author of "The Place-
Names of Scotland," etc. Medium
8vo. 15s. net.

"It is a very fine attempt of the compactness of the whole
subject, which has given all now been accomplished, and a
very worthily represents the twenty years of leisure given
to it." — *The Observer*

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 12s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed either to the Hon. Treas. Mr. H. Williamson, 46, Park Road, Pendleton, Manchester; or to the Hon. Secy. Mr. W. H. Duke, Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor Slater, Bedford College, London, N.W.; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches, viz. Miss R. H. Rees, Ladybarn House, Withington, Manchester; Mr. K. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, Grey Cottage, Blundell Road, Hightown, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss D. Watson, 7, Hughenden Road, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. O. R. A. Byrde, Royal Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. J. M. McGregor, Bedford College, London, N.W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and the Rev. Father Ailingier, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.

KS

S

AD

F

S

ole
it
ren

d
on
nal
to
ate

ual
5s.
gs.
el.
he
he
in
5d.
for

he
or
or
he
n-
A.
er,
d.
e.
on,
y

to
not
'ru
or
the
one
epi
voc
F67
to
the
dev
res
oth
pea
of a

10

43

65

67

70

832

A
to
or
vest
to i
not
δσσ
in 7
of s
N

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1915

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

"Ossa in HESIOD.

THE use of *ὄσσα* in Hesiod is peculiar to the *Theogony*, and even there it does not mean, as in the Homeric poems, 'rumour,' 'report' (a 282 ὄσσαν ἐκ Διός), or the personification of this, "Ossa, the Διὸς ἄγγελος (B 93), but 'voice,' and once 'sound' in general. In the older epic the usual words to express merely vocal sound are *φωνή*, *αὐδή*, *ἀντή*, and *φόπα* (*vocem*). It may be worth while to enquire whether the use of *ὄσσα* in the more general sense is a legitimate development from the earlier and more restricted meaning, or whether any other account can be given of its appearance in the *Theogony*. Let us first of all take a review of the passages:

- 10 ἐννύχαι στείχον περικαλλέει ὄσσαν
 ἰεῖσαι,
43 δώματά τ' ἀθανάτων. αἱ δ' ἄμβροτον
 ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι—
65 ἐν θαλίῃς ἐρατην δὲ διὰ στόμα ὄσσαν
 ἰεῖσαι—
67 ἀθανάτων κλείουσιν, ἐπήρατον ὄσσαν
 ἰεῖσαι.
701 ὀφθαλμοῖσι ἰδεῖν ἢ δ' οὐασιν ὄσσαν
 ἀκοῦσαι—
832 ταύρου ἐριβρύχῳ, μένος ἀσχέτου,
 ὄσσαν ἀγαύρου.

At first sight the usage would seem to be established beyond all question or shadow of doubt, but a closer investigation of the evidence rather tends to invalidate this conclusion. It is to be noticed that in our first four examples *ὄσσα* refers to the singing of the Muses; in 701 it connotes the noise, din, crash, of some vast convulsion of nature, and

in 832 it describes the vocal work of a bull, and so is equally remote from any idea of melodious utterance.

If we examine the context of 701, it is fairly obvious that the line is merely a later addition to the passage, breaking the connection between 700 and 702:

καῦμα δὲ θεσπέσιον κάτεχεν Χάος· εἷσατο
 δ' ἄντα
αὐτῶς ὥς εἰ Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρύς
 ὑπερθε—

Cf. X 410, κ 415 f. That ὄσσαν ἀκοῦσαι is a perverse adaptation from a 282 and β 216 is also evident.

With regard to 832, a similar condemnation is even more inevitable. The four lines 832-5 cannot be the work of the original author of the poem, but of someone not conversant with, or not content to leave undisturbed, the epic use of ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε at the end of a line as an equivalent of 'and reversely,' 'and contrariwise' cf. Σ 472:

ἄλλοτε μὲν σπεύδοντι παρέμμεναι, ἄλ-
 λοτε δ' αὐτε,

'to help him when hard at work, to rest when he rested.'

So here the words immediately preceding—

ἄλλοτε μὲν γὰρ
φθέγγονθ' ὥς τε θεοῖσι συνιέμεν, ἄλλοτε
 δ' αὐτε.

contain a complete statement: 'sometimes their utterance was intelligible to the gods, sometimes not.' Thus ran

the description of the vocal powers of the serpent-heads of Typhoeus originally. Then the interpolater expanded it into the trashy fancies of 832-5 with his bull and his lion and his puppies and his whistle, a very loud whistle, of course, ὑπο δ' ἤχεεν οὔρεα μακρά.

Our remaining four lines all end with *ἰεῖσαι*, and fortunately there is one other line in Hesiod, and in this very passage in the *Theogony* that exhibits that participle, 830:

παντοίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι ἀθέσφατον· ἄλλοτε
μὲν γάρ—

This is enlightening. Why do we find ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι and not ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι? It certainly seems curious that the later Greeks should have preferred to maltreat seriously a familiar participle rather than interfere with an obsolete noun even by aspirating the consonant π. Yet that they did so is clear from the tradition here and *Hymn. Hom.* xxvii. 18, αἱ δ' ἀμβροσίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι, where we have the phenomenon repeated.

Now if we compare this ἀμβροσίην ὅπ' ἰεῖσαι with 43 ἀμβροτον ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι, the suspicion instantly arises that the latter is merely an evasion of the former expression, the true reading in both cases being:

ἀμβροσίην ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι.

So far, it may be admitted, we have suspicion only, though of a fairly strong character, and capable of being changed into conviction, if further evidence can be found to confirm it or even to add to its probability. For this evidence let us turn to 65:

διὰ στόμα ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι.

A previous investigation, for which see *Homeric*, o 109, led me to the conclusion that διὰ with the accusative implies movement strictly within the limits of the particular space, and may be rendered 'throughout,' e.g. διὰ δώματα: but with the genitive it expresses passage or penetration from end to end, from outside to outside, e.g. δι' αἵματος, δι' ὄμων. Here, then, I submit that the appropriate expression is not διὰ στόμα, 'in the mouth,' but διὰ στόματος, 'out of the mouth.' In Ξ 91:

μῦθον, ὃν οὐ κεν ἀνὴρ γε διὰ στόμα πᾶν
παν ἄγοιτο

'in' or 'into the mouth' is the meaning; but that sense is inadmissible in our line. It is, I think, almost a necessary conclusion that the original ran thus:

διὰ στόματος ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι.

The very termination of στόματος half suggests the supplanting noun to which the objectionable ὅφ' (ὅπα) has yielded the position.

Next we have to consider 67 ἐπύρατον ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι. To come to the point at once, I submit that this represents without much ambiguity an original:

ἐπητανὸν ὅφ' ἰεῖσαι.

There is some doubt whether ἐπύρατος is really a good epic form as a synonym of ἐρατός v. Nitzsch on δ 606; but there can be none that the appearance of both as epithets of ὅσσα within three lines, as here, is an undesirable and unpleasing peculiarity. The suggested ἐπητανόν, a Hesiodic word, appropriately marks the continuous flow (cf. ζ 86 πλυνοὶ ἦσαν ἐπητανοί) of musical utterance, an idea that appears also in the ἀκάματος ῥέει αὐδὴ of l. 39.

To return for a moment to 43 αἱ δ' ἀμβροτον ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι, it is not unimportant to observe that in this case, our real starting-point, conjectural emendation has not been resorted to, the true reading, or what is assumed to be such, having been preserved *verbatim* with one very small lapse in the tradition of *Hom. Hymn.* xxvii. 18. We have also in the *Theogony* itself, 69 ἀμβροσίην μολπῇ.

It follows, of course, that 10 περικαλλέα ὅσσαν ἰεῖσαι cannot in its present form be the work of an early epic writer. Περικαλλής, I may remark, is elsewhere always applied to a visible object, and as it is found in about seventy passages in Homer, the anomaly here, to say nothing of the hiatus, is a little surprising. Possibly περι- has ousted an original ὅπα here, and ὅπα κάλλιμον may be right, as in μ 192 ἰεῖσαι ὅπα κάλλιμον. A quite tolerable line might be made by

ὅπα κάλλιμον ἐκπροῖεσαι.

However, leaving l. 10 out of the reckoning, counting it as not unconfirmable to the others and no more, I submit that the above passages, though separately perhaps open to some doubt, yet taken together afford ample and sufficient evidence for the conclusion that *ῥσσα* is an innovation and importation of later times in all these places, and that the desertion of the true Homeric sense of this word, which is apparently characteristic of the *Theogony*,

is not to be attributed to the original author of that work, but affords a striking and valuable example of the extent of the modernisation or popular simplification to which the early epic poetry was subjected by its later unsophisticated custodians, the Homeridae or the whole Hellenic race.

In the *Little Iliad. Fragm. ii.* 3 *πῶς ἐπεφωνήσω* should probably be *πῶς ὀπὶ φωνήσω*. Cf. *Homericæ*, l. 456.

T. L. AGAR.

A NOTE ON THE WORD ACCENT IN GREEK MUSIC.

GABELENTZ, in his *Sprachwissenschaft*, second edition, p. 377, when speaking of the Chinese tones, makes the following remark: 'Beim Gesange überbleibt der Wortton deutlich vernehmbar. Auch dies spricht für seine Selbständigkeit dem musikalischen Tone gegenüber; denn das Lied wird dadurch nicht misstönend.' Unfortunately he does not explain how this comes about.

Classical Greek also had a musical word accent: at the same time speakers of this musically accented language used to sing in it. The question therefore presents itself: Was the musical word accent of ordinary speech completely neglected in singing? If not, how was its presence reconciled with the melody?¹

I think that the answer to these questions may perhaps be found in the specimen of Greek music published by Henri Weil and Théodore Reinach under the title 'Hymne à Apollon'—Extrait du Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Ecole Française d'Athènes, 1894.²

The facts at present generally established as to the nature of the Greek accent are as follows:

1. The accented syllable represented a higher tone than the unaccented.

2. The acute (*α*) on a short vowel was a

simple high tone, e.g. *ὁδός* = \cup | \cup ; (*b*) on a long vowel or diphthong was a high tone on the second mora—e.g. *θεᾶ* = \cup | $\cup\cup$.

3. The circumflex was a high tone on the first mora—e.g. *θεᾶς* = \cup | $\cup\cup$.

4. The grave probably represented a low tone—e.g. *τῆμης ἄπο* = $\cup\cup$ | $\cup\cup$ | \cup | \cup , but *ἀπὸ τῆμης* = \cup | \cup | $\cup\cup$ | $\cup\cup$.

An examination of the above-mentioned piece of music seems to me to show that in musical composition (or, at least, in this example of it) this system of word accentuation was not altogether neglected.

In all there are 94 words of more than one syllable bearing either the acute or the circumflex. In 61 of these the highest note of the word falls on the accented syllable; in 27 the accented syllable is equally high with some other syllable or syllables of the same word; and in 6 only is it lower. That is to say, in 93·7 per cent. of the words the accented syllable is musically higher than, or equally high with, the other syllables.

Out of the 27 cases in which the accented syllable is equally high with another syllable of the same word, in 17 it is followed, in 3 preceded, and in 2 followed and preceded by a lower note. In 1 case the preceding note has not been recovered; and in 4 cases the preceding and following notes are equally high. That is to say, in 84·6 per cent. of these words the accented syllable is either followed or preceded by a lower note.

Of the 6 cases in which the accented

¹ As far as I know this question has not been previously discussed: at least there is no mention of it in the latest edition of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik*.

² In the absence of books of reference I do not know if more pieces have since been discovered.

syllable is lower than another in the same word, in 1 (*δικόρυφον*, d-e-d-f) the accented syllable is preceded and followed by lower notes; in 2 (*δικορύνια*, g-a flat-g-e flat-e flat; *φερόπλοιο*, d flat-c-b-b flat) the accented syllable is followed by a lower note; 1 ([*θε*]ω[*ρ*]ων, x-a flat-f) rests upon conjecture, though tolerably certain; 2 only do not seem to admit of any explaining away: *θνατοι-οι-ς προφαίνει*, g-d flat-f-g-g-f, [*θα*]λος φίλον, x-g-g-a flat.

If then we make a provisional statement that the accented syllable must be sung on a higher note than either that preceding or following, we find in 94 words only 2 exceptions, a rate of 2.1 per cent.

There are 7 cases in which an acute vowel is sung on two different notes: in 5 the second mora has the higher tone, in 2 the first.

There are 10 cases in which a circumflexed vowel is sung on two different notes: in 9 the first mora has the higher tone, in 1 the second; that is, in comparison with the acute, the case of the circumflex is reversed. The one exception is *θνατοι-οις*, g-d flat-f, already mentioned as an exception in another respect.

Some long unaccented vowels are sung on two different notes. In 5 cases the vowel follows an accented syllable: of these 3 have the higher note on the first mora, 2 on the second. There are 7 cases in which the vowel precedes an accented syllable: of these 6 have the higher note on the second mora, 1 on the first. This is the case of *δικόρυφον κλει-ειτύν*, d-e-d-f-d-b flat-d, where the split syllable follows the highest (though unaccented) syllable of the previous word.

There seems to be no regulation as to the interval between the morae of an acute or circumflex, or between accented and unaccented syllables. The interval varies from a semitone to 5 full tones.

If then conclusions may be drawn from a comparatively small number of examples, they are these:

1. There was a very strong tendency, amounting almost to necessity, to make the accented syllable of the word sung on the highest note, or at least to make it higher than either the preceding, or, preferably, the following syllable.

2. When a long accented vowel was sung on two notes, there was a tendency in the case of acute vowels to make the second mora the higher, in the case of circumflexed vowels a strong tendency to make the first the higher.

This agrees generally with what we know of the nature of these accents.

3. When a long unaccented vowel was sung on two notes, there was a tendency in the case of those preceding an accented syllable to make the second mora the higher, in the case of those following an accented syllable to make the first the higher.

This is in agreement with what we may surmise to have been the nature of the vowels following an accented syllable from a comparison with the Vedic accent. Here an acute (*udātta*) syllable was always followed by a syllable characterised by a falling tone (*svarita*)—that is, a tone of which the first mora (in the case of long vowels) was higher than the second.

R. L. TURNER.

Benares.

ON AN ARCHAIC THESSALIAN EPIGRAM.

IN *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xxxv. (1911), p. 239, No. 8, J. Hatzfeld published an archaic epitaph as from Zarizani near Ellassona (Oloösson), which he transcribed as follows:

Νεπία ἔος ἔθανον καὶ οὐ λά[β]ον ἄνθος
ἔτ' ἔβας,
ἀλλ' ἰκόμαν πρὸς τὲν πολυδάκρυον εἰς
Ἀχέροντα.

μῦμα δὲ τῆδε πατὲρ Ἱππεράνορος παῖς
Κλεόδαμος
στᾶσέ με Θεσσαλίου καὶ μάτερ θυγατρὶ
Κορόνα.

The editor refers in his commentary only to the date of the inscription, which he attributes to the beginning of the fifth century at latest, and to the

metrical irregularities of the last two lines.

In a series of valuable notes on published Thessalian texts, A. S. Arvanitopoulos gives a photographic reproduction of a squeeze of the epitaph in question, which, he maintains, was found at Oloösön itself, and adds further particulars regarding the discovery, the nature and the dimensions of the stele ('*Arch. Eph.* 1913, 180 f.). In two respects his reading differs from that of Hatzfeld. For *πρὸς τὸν* he would substitute *πρόσθεν* (i.e. *πρόσθεν*), though allowing that this form is 'difficult of interpretation' and giving a reference only to 'l. 2 at the end,' which I take to relate to *ἐτ'* in place of *ἐθ'* towards the close of l. 1. This change we must, I think, accept, not only because Hatzfeld's reading is not easily intelligible ('I came to the lady of many tears' must, if retained, refer to the soul's journey to the realm of Persephone), but also because Thessalian inscriptions afford several parallels to this psilosis. It will be sufficient to quote the following cases from *I.G.* ix. 2: *ἐλέστειν* (*ἐλέσθαι*) in 513, *πεπείστειν* (*πεπείσθαι*) in 517 l. 16, *ἀρχιπρουρέϊσας* and *σύμπρουροι* (*ἀρχιφρουρήσας*, *σύμφρουροι*) in 1058, and *Αἰσκυλῖς* in 431. The opposite process is exemplified by the forms *ἐγένονθο* (517 l. 12) and *ἐζλονθο* (513).

Arvanitopoulos' second suggestion is to my mind less happy. Since Hatzfeld's *ἔος* (*ἔως*) gives no sense, he proposes to read *νηπίαος*, i.e. *νηπίαος*. To this he himself brings forward one objection, that we should expect a feminine in *-αία* rather than in *-αος*, but there are three further difficulties on which he does not touch. In the first place, I cannot find that the word *νηπίαος* exists at all; at least, I have looked vainly for it in Liddell and Scott, the *Thesaurus* and van Herwerden's *Lexicon*. Secondly, it is metrically unsound, and, though this epigram is not lacking in errors of metre,

it is unlikely that the common term *νηπίαχος* should have been passed over in favour of a word which, even if its existence be granted, suits the verse less well. Further, I am not aware that in Thessalian *αι* is represented by *αε*, as it is occasionally in other dialects, as for example in *μαέας* (Brycus, *S.G.D.I.* 4317), *Ἀεάκης* (Samos, *Ath. Mitt.* xxxi. 151 ff.), *Φαενώ* (*Brit. Mus. Cat. Coins: Ionia*, Pl. III. 8), *Ἀθαναέα*, *Περαεόθεν* (Corinth, *S.G.D.I.* 3119 h, i), *Ἀέθων* and *Ἀέθρα* (Kretschmer, *Gr. Vasenschr.* 33 f., 176). It may be that these four objections taken singly would not justify a rejection of Arvanitopoulos' conjecture, but their cumulative force is, I think, considerable.

I am therefore inclined to adhere to the view which suggested itself to me immediately upon reading Hatzfeld's publication, namely that the true reading is *νηπία εἰός*. For the form of the participle we may compare two other dialect inscriptions of Thessaly, *I.G.* ix. 2. 506 *ἀντιγραφείος ἐόντος* *Αἰσχύλοι*, and 517 l. 14 *ἐτ τοῖ παρεόντος* (*ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος*, l. 6). The inconsistency in the representation or omission of the elided vowels is a common phenomenon and may be paralleled, to give but a single example, in another archaic epitaph of Thessaly, *I.G.* ix. 2. 255.

Corona is the name of the deceased girl's mother: the existence of a corresponding masculine form *Coronus* is attested by the patronymic adjectives found in a list of new citizens of Larisa: *Ἀντιφάνεις Κορούνειος*, *Ἀρισ[το]φάνεις Κορούνειος* (*I.G.* ix. 2. 517 ll. 57, 58). The formation of the daughter's name, *Thessalia*, is paralleled by that of the names *Ἑλλάς* (*I.G.* ix. 2. 423, 538) and *Μακεδονία* (*ibid.* 538, 563), to cite but two instances which occur in Thessaly itself. Other examples are given in Bechtel - Fiick, *Griech. Personennamen*, 347 ff.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College.

CATULLUS, LXXXIV.

IN the August number of the *Classical Review*¹ Mr. A. J. Bell throws welcome light on *Catulli nobile epigramma*. I have long thought, as Mr. Bell thinks, that an epigram, especially if it is by Catullus, should grow to a point; and lately I have guessed, as Mr. Bell guesses, at the origin of the over-aspiration which Catullus ridicules and Quintilian records.² Let me give my views in friendly rivalry with Mr. Bell. *σύν τε δὴ ἔρχομένο.*

The poem owes its order and its spare aspirates to Politian. What we read as the second couplet comes in the manuscripts fifth, where it is badly in the way.³ As for the aspirates, the manuscripts have *commoda* twice in the first line, no *chommoda*; and the most and best of them are just as innocent of *hinsidias* in what is now and rightly the fourth line, and of *Hionios* at the end.⁴ In the second line, however, the three manuscripts that matter have readings which deserve more attention than they have received. O ends the line with *insidias hee*, G and R with *insidias he*, though in R the *he* has been struck out.⁵

What are we to make of *hee* and *he*? Friedrich, of course, knows all about them. 'Some scribe, who did not understand Catullus's banter, had written in the margin *hahe* or *hahahe* (= *hahae*, *hahahae*), of which *hee* and *he* are the remains.' A scribe who read the poem as it appears in our manuscripts might well hum and haw, but I doubt if he would guffaw; the humour of the scribes of

Catullus, though plentiful, is unconscious.

Thanks to Quintilian, we know more or less where the aspirates should be put in. *Chommoda* we must have, and in one of the other words the aspirate was probably initial; but why in both, and, if not in both, in which? O G R point not to *hinsidias* but to *insidiash*, where *sh* would not be pronounced as in 'smash,' but might denote some weak fricative with a sound halfway between *s* and *h*, somewhat as the Northumbrian burr is halfway between *r* and *h*. If that is what Catullus meant, he may not have been sure how his readers would take the unfamiliar combination of letters, and possibly he helped matters by writing *insidias he*, which we find in G R. Let no one object that then the line would not scan.

For this decay of final *s* I know no such evidence as Quintilian's for the other two faults; but something may be inferred from the history of Latin and Greek. Ancient Greek is full of words whose initial *s* has become the rough breathing, which means nothing in the Greek of to-day. In other Greek words medial *s* has been lost; the Laconian forms *παῖ*, *Μῶά*, *Ποιδάν*, show a half-way stage. Plato¹ reckons sigma among the 'windy' letters, with phi, psi, zeta. Final *s* had a precarious existence in Latin from early times, and on the way to Italian it has been altogether lost. We may conjecture that such processes began with the decay which I suppose, *s-h*; that the *h* came to prevail over the *s*; and that lastly the *h* was lost in its turn.

But the question between *hinsidias* and *insidias-h* is by the way. The trouble about the poem is that it has all the look of rising to a climax, yet falls miserably flat. Even with the help of Mr. Bell the last couplet does not draw from me a *hahahae*.

A clue is given by *horribilis*. What had happened was something to shudder or shiver at. To be brief, I guess that the last word of the poem should be

¹ *Crat.* 427A (πνευμάτωδὴ τὰ γράμματα . . . ὅταν πού τὸ φωνῶδες μῆνται . . .).

¹ Pp. 137-139.

² See the Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, February 10, 1910, and November 5, 1914.

³ Doubtless the occurrence of the same word at the end of the first and second couplets led to omission, a marginal supplement, and insertion in the wrong place.

⁴ One MS. (d) is said to have *hinsiadas* in l. 4; another (p), which embodies some conjectures made in the fifteenth century, has *hyonios* in l. 12. D has *hionios*; but D dates from 1463, and the *h* may have been added after Politian's restoration of the poem.

⁵ L, which draws some things from O, has *insidias haec*, probably from misreading O's *hee* as *hec*. Schulze's M, which Hale has shown to be a copy of R, has *hinsidias*, forestalling Politian so far, it seems.

χινέους. When Arrius crossed, his aspirates blew up a blizzard, and the sea has been snow-swept ever since.

Here it will certainly be objected that then the line will not scan. I am not so sure. In modern Greek, to an English ear, χ is just *h* and no more. How soon it degenerated from *kh* I cannot tell, but the process was probably gradual, and in the time of Catullus the sound may have been *h* to a Roman ear if not to a Greek. That the Latin poets, when they were not punning, still treated χ as *ch* in their loans from Greek, is no matter; they knew how the Greek poets treated it (even as we know how French treats its so-called aspirate, though we wonder why), and they followed suit. However, if a critic had been rash enough to point out the metrical flaw, Catullus might have answered in the words of Rhinthon,

ὁ σὲ Διόνυσος αὐτὸς ἐξώληθι θεῖη.
Ἰππῶνακτος τὸ μέτρον. οὐδὲν μοι μέλει,
or in the spirit of Artemus Ward,
'N.B.—This is a goak.'

If χινέους is right, it gives us an initial aspirate in disguise. If *insidias-h* also is right, Catullus gives Arrius aspirates in three different places, whereas with the *hinsidias* and *Hionios* of our texts he plays the same trick twice.

It is sad work explaining another man's jokes, especially so frigid a joke as this. Let us turn to comparative philology, a gayer theme.

To the best of Mr. Bell's knowledge and mine, nobody has explained whence the vulgar vice of over-aspiration arose. Like Mr. Bell I suspect some influence from outside, though such changes of speech are often, I dare say, of native growth. Mr. Bell is for Etruscan as the outside influence; I am for Venetic.

The scanty remains of the Venetic language have recently been enriched

and expounded¹ by Professor R. S. Conway. Here is an inscription on a votive nail:

·e.χ·etor e.r.iimonelo me·xo zona.s.to śahnateh
rehtia·h porah .u.zeroφo.s

Venetic has aspirates here, there, and everywhere: aspirated consonants written with the Greek letters θ φ χ; such sequences of letters as *vh*, *ahs*, *ht*, *hm*; and, above all, many words ending in *ah*, *eh*, *oh*. When speakers of Venetic, or their descendants, took to Latin, no wonder they raised a wind.

Now Professor Conway's inscriptions come from Este, Padua, Verona, and Vicenza. To Verona belonged Catullus, and the other towns are all within fifty miles. Whether Arrius too came from thereabouts we do not know, but we can see that the personalities and topicalities of Catullus, apart from Rome and his excursions to Bithynia and Spain, keep pretty close to his home.² To say nothing of Verona itself, we have Brescia and Como; Alfenus Varus came from Cremona; the Annals of Volusius were to die by the Padua, a mouth of the Po. So Arrius may have come from Venetic parts. Whether the Veneti were as matriarchally minded as Mr. Bell's Etruscans, I cannot say.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ To the British Academy on July 22, 1908; to the Cambridge Philological Society on May 14, 1914 (Proceedings, 1914, p. 6). Professor Conway has very kindly read my paper in manuscript, and has bettered it in more than one place.

² See particularly B. Schmidt's preface to his text. Schmidt collects evidence from Cisalpine inscriptions for the names of several of the poet's friends and foes; and I see that two of Professor Conway's epitaphs from Este have the names *iuvva.n.tsa·h* and *iuvva.n.tiō·h*, which recall the *Juventius* of Catullus.

HORACE AND THE SCHOLIA.

Do we give sufficient attention to the scholia of Acron or of Porphyrio? I know the blunders that occur in both, blunders obvious to any schoolboy. But we have also in these scholia translations and explanations of obscure and difficult passages coming from men who

spoke the poet's language, and who had at their disposal the fruits of study in the intervening centuries. In interpreting the part do we give these their proper value? A consideration of the scholia on Hor. *Ep.* I. v. 3 may help us to answer this question. I have just

been reading in Prof. Courtand's book on the Epistles his account of the Epistle to Torquatus (*Ep.* I. v.), and felt a little disturbed by his insistence on 'the hour of sunset' (*supremo sole*, v. 3). On p. 90 he tells us 'l'invitation est pour le jour même, au coucher du soleil'; and again on p. 100, 'souper ne commençant qu'avec le coucher du soleil, comme il sied entre gens de moeurs régulières.' Really one is not surprised at Orelli's feeling that an invitation to a banquet so little out of tune with the rules of Roman propriety hardly justified such strictures on economy as we find in v. 12: *Parcus ob heredis curam nimiumque severus adsidet insano*. For a like reason Ribbeck, a much keener critic of Roman poetry than the Romans themselves, was for banishing vv. 12-20 as having no proper motion in the Epistle.

There are other reasons for questioning the translation of *supremo sole* by 'the hour of sunset.' If it is sunset, there is surely no need for Torquatus' leaving his house by a back-door to avoid the client waiting in the hall (v. 31); for the court has been closed these couple of hours. Or is the mention of the *clientem atria servantem* merely a jocular way of emphasising the fact that the hall of this distinguished advocate is always filled with clients? But *rebus omissis* (v. 30)? Surely, now that the court is closed, we should rather expect *rebus confectis*? For there is to be no court on the morrow, and the 'light hopes and struggles for riches and the case of Moschus' that Torquatus is to leave (*mitte* in v. 8 is for *omitte*) is the poet's way of describing the business of to-day. But it is not fitting to bid him desert this business at sunset; it would be finished by that time. I turn to the scholia, and read in Acron: *Supremo te sole, Hoc est: Cum est altissimus medio die, ut supreme Juppiter*; and in Porphyrio: *Supremo, summo, id est, hora sexta*. At once all the difficulties we have noted disappear. The client guarding the hall, and the abandonment of the day's business are at once explained. There is no occasion for Orelli's worry over Horace's lecture to Torquatus on his too great zeal for gain; none for Ribbeck's feel-

ing that vv. 12-20 have no sufficient motive in the rest of the Epistle. Horace is not playing the moral prig; on the contrary, he is begging Torquatus to violate the proprieties for once and join him at noon, throwing over all business for the day. The tie of friendship, which would justify this, must have been close of course; it was to Torquatus that Horace addressed Ode IV. 7 (*diffugere nives*), an ode so thrilled with regret for the shortness of life and of such high poetic quality, that we may well believe the tie of friendship that called it forth one of the closest. Why the interpretation of the scholia has been rejected by all the editors I know, it is difficult to see. It is quite true that in prose *summus* is usually 'highest,' and *supremus* 'last.' But poetry often takes the opposite meaning from prose; and Horace has here used *supremus* for 'highest' just as in the first verse of his first Epistle he used *summus* for 'last.' He tells us in his *Ars Poetica* (vv. 47-48): *Dixeris egregie notum si callida verbum reddiderit iunctura novum*. When (*Ep.* II. 1. 70) he calls his old schoolmaster *plagosus*, the fact that till then *plagosus* had the meaning 'subjected to many blows' did not disturb him; for he felt sure that the *callida iunctura* with Orbilius would make his meaning clear. Here, too, he trusted that the *cliens atria servans*, the *res omissae*, his pleading with Torquatus not to value fame and money more than the enjoyment of life with a friend, would make the *supremo sole* clear to his readers, as in fact they did to his readers in Rome. It is a similar use of *cessatum* for *qui cessavit* which has led to so much difficulty and doubt about the reading of the Blandinian codex—*cessatum ducere somnum* (*Ep.* I. 2. 31), where *ducere* is poetic for *reducere*. The adjective or participle ending in *-tus* is very much older than the passive voice, and is primarily often active in meaning, e.g. in Skt. *gatus*, 'having come.' So both Horace and Virgil feel free to use it in the older active sense at times, e.g. *per sanctum iuratus* . . . Osirim (*Ep.* I. 17. 60) or *titubata solo* (*Aen.* V. 332). Indeed forms like *potus*, *pransus*, *obsoletus* are usually so used.

So in *Ep.* II. 1. 244: Boeotum in crasso iurares aere natum. I see that the explanation *Boeotum* = *Βοιωτῶν*, given first to my knowledge by Kiessling, meets with much favour. I turn to Acron's scholium, and read: *Boeotum. id est, quem libet ex Boeotia*. And this is confirmed by the close connection we so commonly find between the first and last words of a Latin verse, a connection which is often lost sight of in translating:

Virtus est vitium fugere et sapientia prima
Stultitia caruisse (*Ep.* I. 1. 41).

That the testimony of the scholia is of importance in determining the text is, no doubt, a commonplace to editors; and yet in *Ep.* I. 19. 10, all editors, to my knowledge, read *Hoc simul edixi*. Porphyrio and most of the MSS. give *edixi*, but I read in Acron: *simul edixi, alii edixit*. How can the intelligent reader fail to see how much better *edixit* is here? It is evidently a question of a praetor issuing a decree; and how much more natural it is to make Ennius the praetor (*i.e.* the leader) of Roman poets, especially when the decree is a prohibition of sobriety! That Horace could have written *edixi*, and so proclaimed himself the leading Roman poet at the time when he wrote this epistle, seems an impossibility when we recall his attitude to Virgil. (Since writing the lines above I have read with pleasure M. Courtand's note on p. 319 of his book,¹ where he characterises *edixi* as *une faute de goût*.) Indeed when the scholia join with the MSS. in supporting a reading it seems to me assured. And that is why I felt grieved when in his *Horatiana* of your May number, I read Mr. Gow's characteristic of *honoratum* (*A.P.* 120) as 'foolish.' Both Acron and Porphyrio agree with the MSS. in reading *honoratum*. And Kiessling's explanation of *honoratum* here shows that, far from being foolish, it is quite natural and fully justified. In *A.P.* 128-9 Horace speaks of basing dramatic compositions on the *Iliad*: 'tuque rectius Iliacum carmen deduces in actus.' A tiro might translate *Iliacum carmen* as 'the *Iliad*,'

but a thoughtful student will see at once what nonsense it is to talk of spinning out the twenty-four books of the *Iliad* into five acts. *Iliacum carmen* will be as much of the *Iliad* as a rhapsode can well recite at one time, and will correspond to 'a book of the *Iliad*.' That a play might well be based on a single book of the *Iliad* will not appear strange when we think of the Chryses of Pacuvius. Among all the books of the *Iliad* that which comes nearest dramatic form is the ninth, in which Agamemnon tries to restore to Achilles the honour he took from him in the first, and Achilles in rejecting his proposals shows himself 'impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer.' *Honoratum* seems to me a very natural term, if used to describe the hero of a drama based on the ninth *Iliad*.

I do not think that Mr. Gow will bear me any grudge when I tell him that I prefer what Horace has written to the emendations he suggests in his *Horatiana*. Let him consider with me for a moment the state of things if the gods took him seriously and blotted out the Horatian words he has chosen to emend, substituting his corrections. Mr. Gow would write *an orator* instead of *honoratum*. It is quite likely that the younger Piso was studying rhetoric, as Mr. Gow suggests; all noble Roman youths did so at the time. But would Horace venture on any part in this instruction? He was not a noble Roman, and we have not the slightest reason to suppose that he ever delivered an oration in Rome: what he may have done in Athens or with his legion is another question. Let me turn to Mr. Gow's *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*. He would read in *Carm.* II. 20. 6. *jocas* for *vocas*, 'when you make fun of' or 'banter me,' and he calls attention to Suetonius' tale of how Augustus bantered Horace. But that Maecenas' ridicule of Horace was of the same kindly character we may be permitted to doubt when we recall how he substitutes *stomacheris* for 'rides' in his first epistle. But 'to banter' implies a *habit*, or at least a process, and not an isolated momentary act, and in Latin that should be expressed by the deponent *iocare*, and not by the action *iocas*. *Vocas* does not

¹ Horace, *Sa vie et sa pensée à l'époque des Épîtres*. Hachette, 1914.

mean here 'callest me names,' as Mr. Gow seems to think, but is for *invocas*, 'invitest me to dinner.' Prof. Courtland has fittingly laid stress on one aspect of the dinners in question (p. 91): 'They did not become so usual in Augustus' day merely to gratify the appetite or display the wealth and taste of the entertainer, but for the Romans of the time they represented the life of society, and were frequented for the sole pleasure of meeting one's friends and holding free converse with them.'

When we turn to Mr. Gow's *Metaponticum* we feel still more dubious about his use of the term ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in this connection; he seems to have but little occasion for resorting to the petition: 'Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt.' In this Ode (III. 24. 4) we have no hesitation in accepting the reading of the best MSS., supported by Acron: 'Mare Ponticum Tyrrenum omne. . . et mare Ponticum' will mean 'our whole system of seas to its extremity in the far East.'

In *Sat. I. i. 108* Mr. Gow proposes *aut rarus* for *ut avarus*, breaking the record, as he himself owns. The reading *ut avarus* is that of all MSS., and is supported by both scholiasts. Porphyrio's note hardly justifies Mr. Gow in asserting that he makes the miser content; his words are: 'Qui proposito suo gaudeat solus,' and he follows an alternative suggestion of Acron's: 'In eo quod avarus est, sibi placet'—'The miser is satisfied with his aim, but not with his lot.' Most of us will accept Acron's first explanation: 'Quod omnes alienas condiciones laudant, suas vituperant, sed praecipue avarus, qui miserum dicit et egentem;' and in this connection we might notice the far higher value of Acron's Scholia. But I fear Mr. Gow has failed to notice the real subject of *laudat*, which is *omnis* implied in *nemo*. Whether this implication is usual, or even possible, when another numeral, e.g. '*rarus* intervenes,' it is for Mr. Gow to show.

Ut avarus had escaped emendation till Mr. Gow took pen in hand; very different was the case of *bibes* in—

Caecubum et prelo domitam Caleno
Tu bibes uvam (*Carm. I. 20. 9-10*)

where again *bibes*, the reading of all the MSS., is confirmed by Porphyrio's Scholium. But the editors have had their difficulties with *bibes*. Keller tried *bibis*, but here the second syllable is short; so he resorted to *tum bibes*; 'After you have tried my cheap wine, you may drink your own Caecuban and Calenian.' But Horace tells us plainly that he has no such wine on his table, and the measure of comfort to Maecenas involved in the prospect that he will be able to drink such wines when he returns to the Esquiline, seems but slight. Munro found *bides* in an Irish MS., and corrects it to *vides*, poetic for *provides*, and Krüger follows the same idea in his *liques*, which has no MSS. support. But one would like to think better of Maecenas, despite his physical delicacy. Mr. Gow suggests *inbes*, and rightly maintains that *inbes* may mean 'order up from the kitchen' or 'from the wine cellar.' But there are no such wines in Horace's cellar; it would be like the great Welshman's call. Those who have followed the sensible plan of retaining *bibes*, backed as it is by such MSS. authority, have had their troubles too. It might be a permissive future, thinks Mr. Gow, if it were not within a few lines of the regular future, *potabis*. I count Mr. Gow happy, who can tell just what future a poet will not venture to place within a few lines of any other future. Prof. Clement Smith thinks it has a concession—hortatory force; and I begin to feel the charm of, say, *suasive*, *predictive*, *commendatory*, but recollect the need of a judicious and temperate use of grammar, especially in dealing with poets. Kiessling compares *laudabunt* (*Carm. I. 7. 1*) 'Their aim will be to praise'; but this seems rather a future of probability, corresponding in a way to the *perfectum logicum*. 'It will be your wish to drink' seems hardly so likely as 'you will wish you had drunk'; and neither phrase seems quite in place in a note of invitation. 'I must leave you to drink,' says Wickham, and compares *Scriberis Vario*, a plain commendatory future. But I fancy that Horace joins in drinking these fine wines with Maecenas when he has the chance. And yet the mean-

ing seemed clear enough to me, when as a boy I first read the Ode. Horace wonders at his daring in inviting Maecenas to come to his Sabine farm and share his rough fare there, when he thinks of his magnificent cheer at Rome, both at table and in the theatre; in the last four verses he again contrasts this cheer with what he has to offer. 'Caecuban and grapes crushed by the Calenian winepress you will be drinking; neither Falernian vines nor the hills of Formiae flavour my cups.' The future seems quite as natural here in the Latin as in the English; but its real nature and force will bear closer definition. The best appreciation of its force here that I have seen, I find in Nauck: '*Bibes* ist hier wenig verschieden von *bibis*, nur weniger zuversichtlich;' *vgl.* I. 7. 1 and 9, *laudabunt* and '*dicet* neben *sunt quibus*' in I. 7. 5.' *Laudabunt* and *dicet* are futures of probability, reasoning from the past to the present and

future; and so is *bibes* here, but it has the present more clearly in view, and indeed is contrasting this present with a future hoped for by the poet and possibly close at hand. We seem, too, to have in this future a transference from distance in time to distance in space. Horace, looking forward to the coming of Maecenas, writes to him: 'Vile Sabinum, quod fundus praestiterit, tu mecum potabis.' The future gives a consummation remote in time; not very remote, the poet hopes. Looking out from his Sabine hill to the distant Esquiline, he writes 'Caecubum *bibes*'; and by *bibes* he means 'you will now be drinking'; indeed, one feels that he might have written *nunc bibes*, as Catullus wrote *nunc amabit* (VIII. 17), and Horace himself wrote *nunc tempus erat* (Ode I. 37. 4). Distance in space as well as distance in time may give occasion for the future of probability.

A. J. BELL.

Victoria College, Toronto.

NOTES

SOPHOCLES, *OEDIPUS TYRAN-*
NUS, l. 1219.

THE reading of the Laurentian MS. is

δύρομαι γὰρ ὡς περίαλλα
ἰαχέων ἐκ στομάτων

the objections to which are stated in Jebb's note. He himself reads

δύρομαι γὰρ ὥσπερ ἰάλεμον
χέων ἐκ στομάτων

He thinks that *ἰάλεμον χέων* being written *ἰαλεμὸ χέων* produced *ἰάλεμ ἄχέων* or *ἰαχέων*; 'the attempt to find an intelligible word in the immediately preceding group of letters would then quickly produce the familiar *περίαλλα*.'

But *ὥσπερ ἰάλεμον χέων* is a long way from *ὡς περίαλλα ἰαχέων*, and it is difficult to see how the corruption can have occurred.

The Laurentian MS. divides the line at *περίαλλα*, and any uncial MS. from which L. was copied would look something like this:

ΔΤΡΟΜΑΙΓΑΡΟΣΠΕΡΙΑΛΛΑ
ΙΑΧΕΟΝ etc.

May not Sophocles have written

ΔΤΡΟΜΑΙΓΑΡΟΣΠΕΡΙΑΜ'
ΙΑΝΧΕΟΝ etc.?

The change of M to ΛΛ is easy, and the N of IAN (which Burges proposed) may have escaped a copyist's notice; or, later, in a minuscule MS., *ἰὰν χέων* may have been written *ἰὰ χέων*—the resultant in both cases being *ἰαχέων*. This explains the hiatus (*περίαλλα*) in L. A scribe, who knew the word *περίαλλα*, but nothing of scansion, finding *περίαλλ*, simply added the *a*, which again may have found its way from the margin into the text. This at least keeps nearer to the MSS. than Jebb's conjecture. As regards the sense—the chorus are giving an explanation of their perhaps unworthy lamentations. After all, it is Oedipus who feels the effect of his deed, not the chorus. The latter, by having just said

εἶθε σ' εἶθε σε
μήποτ' εἰσιδόμαν,

feel that they are showing ingratitude for the services rendered to Thebes by

Oedipus, in ridding them of the baneful Sphinx, and, therefore, now give a semi-apologetic explanation of their useless wailings:

δύρομαι γὰρ ὥσπερ ἰαμὴ
ἰὰν χέων ἐκ στομάτων:

'For I lament pouring my voice from my lips as if it were a relief (comfort) (to me).' ὥσπερ . . . χέων is emphatic; i.e., 'I know my lament effects nothing; it cannot undo the past; but I derive some comfort and relief from my tears.' The chorus go on τὸ δ' ὀρθὸν εἰπεῖν ἀνέπνευσα τ' ἐκ σέθεν

καὶ κατεκοίμῃσα τοῦμόν ὄμμα:

'and, to speak truth, thou both gavest me new life (i.e. by destroying the Sphinx) and (now) hast shed darkness over my eye (i.e. by the discovery of the sin).'

A close parallel to the use of ἰαμα is found in Aesch. Fr. 382: στεναγμοί, τῶν πόνων ἰάματα.

A. E. ROCHE.

ON THE DERIVATION OF 'FAMULUS,' 'FAMILIA.'

THE natural derivation of 'famulus,' perhaps because of its simplicity, appears to have passed unnoticed. Of the current explanations, that based on Festus, 'origo ab Oscis dependet apud quos servus famel nominatur,' merely shifts the ground from 'famulus' to 'famel,' and we get no further. Curtius

proposed to connect the Sanskrit 'dhā,' Greek τίθημι, with the Oscan 'faama' (house) = Lat. 'domus,' and so 'famulus' would mean 'houseman.' Others try to force a connection with χαμαί, χαμαλός, 'humilis,' so that 'famulus' would = 'humble man.' A third derivation is from FAC in 'facio,' and 'famulus' then is 'workman.' Isidore, who has an explanation for most words, contents himself with 'famulus, dicitur a propria servorum familia,' which is not very helpful.

It seems at least as probable as any of these attempts that 'famulus' is a diminutive from 'fames,' and originally meant 'a hungry man,' 'a starveling'; just as 'situlus,' the diminutive of 'sitis,' means 'a thirsty one,' 'a water pot.' The 'famulus,' we may suppose, was originally a broken man, who was glad to join another household and work for his food; whether he was worth his keep would depend partly upon his appetite. In the hierarchy of the household he would come after the 'dominus' and 'liberi' ('the master' and 'the free'), but before the 'servi' and the 'vernae' ('the saved captives' and the 'houseborn'), for theoretically he was not a slave. But to the master children, helpers, and slaves were alike hungry mouths to feed, and 'familia' ('the collection of starvelings') included all, even the invited friends, who sat round his table and consumed their measured portion—'mensa.'

F. A. WRIGHT.

Birkbeck College.

REVIEWS

DEMOSTHENES AND THE LAST DAYS OF GREEK FREEDOM.

Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom; 384-322 B.C. *Heroes of the Nations Series*. By A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE. 7½" x 5". Pp. 512. 26 illustrations; 2 plans and a map. Putnam's Sons.

It was fitting that the lot of biographer of the great Athenian orator should fall to one whose notable rendering of the *Public Speeches* had already revealed his

insight into the character of their author.

This life of Demosthenes by Mr. Pickard-Cambridge at once takes its place alongside those of other 'classical' heroes in the same series—biographies whose reputation never stood in need of critical advocacy. These volumes, indeed, represent the better side of the movement to popularise the classics—an attempt which in works such as the

present is made consistent with the dignity of the subject and with sound scholarship. Throughout this volume the fact is never lost sight of that the subject has to be presented to an audience in whom a classical education cannot be assumed, and this difficult task is accomplished with an ease and naturalness which is never betrayed into mere patronising explanation. For the same reason, presumably, we are presented with no abstracted life of an individual, but we have revealed to us the whole stage upon which the drama of the great orator's life was enacted. For the purposes of the series this is undoubtedly an advantage, and though classical scholars will perhaps feel a certain impatience with what may appear excursions into rather remote regions, there can be no doubt that the work as a whole gains much in breadth and interest, while we can consent to tarry if by the way we gather such fruitful grains as, for instance, the brilliant character-sketch of Philip, the analysis of the policy of Eubulus, or the estimate of the political ideals of Isocrates. But classical scholars will find a series of exhaustive notes and appendices which, taken in conjunction with the text, make it a contribution to serious history.

As regards the subject-matter in general, Mr. Pickard-Cambridge's conclusions on the various difficult points that occur are always closely-reasoned and sometimes convincing, though perhaps in a 'popular' work we might have been spared a good deal of the processes of criticism and treated more simply to results. Nor in a *Heroes* series do we need to such an extent the excessive caution of critical scholarship. We think, in fact, that Mr. Pickard-Cambridge should have dealt less laboriously and more confidently with his material and relegated more to his appendices.

In particular, in the most interesting chapter on the Athenian democracy, it was surely an omission that what is frequently elsewhere implied is not here explicitly given as one of the causes contributing to the imperialistic 'hankerings' of the Athenian masses, viz., the fact that they expected those im-

perial aspirations to be realised at the expense of others. For when from neither the state revenues (which is not felt as a private expense), nor from the pockets of the rich, funds were forthcoming for mercenaries, etc., the Athenian citizens' imperial vision tended to become myopic.

Again—if we are to have such matters discussed—the close connection between the peace policy of the commercial magnates and the mercenary system is not brought out, though it is obvious that for a successful 'trade policy' and 'trade empire' you must have not only an army or armament, but an army or armament under the control of the interests concerned. Now the Athenian naval system—from the latter part of the Peloponnesian War till the great reforms of Demosthenes—always contained the germs of the possibility of sectional or 'party-interest' control, and all the evidence tends to the conclusion that this possibility was sedulously developed by the commercial interest in close connection and co-ordinately with the mercenary system. The natural distaste of the people for foreign service and the love of selfish idleness was no doubt deliberately encouraged by the wealthy classes, for whom, by such policy, freedom of control was secured. This is why the 'theoric' money was always brandished in public by Eubulus and his party before Demosthenes and the opposition. The relations, in fact, of Eubulus to the peace party finds some analogy, though a distant one, in the hopes, however vain and intermittent, which the 'equites' entertained with regard to Pompey.

Lastly, in the discussion of Philip's motives for the strikingly different treatment accorded by him to Thebes and to Athens, while admitting the force of the arguments adduced, are we to deny to Philip the diplomat the perception that the surest and easiest way to burst this the most unnatural of all alliances—that of Athens with Thebes—was the sowing between them of jealousy and suspicion? for favouritism from a 'benefactor' can demolish even sincere friendship—how much more so the 'friendship' of an Athens and a Thebes!

But these are minor points. With regard to the main theme of the book, the life and character of our hero, we are invited to regard a personality whose admitted 'unloveliness' is transfigured in his 'greatness' of soul, such greatness consisting in his burning and single-hearted devotion to the good of his country as that good was conceived by him.

But if, in the first place, greatness consists in knowing what one can not do as well as what one can, Demosthenes so far must forfeit any claim to greatness. For the conditions of the world of his day we can not hold him responsible, but for his failure to appreciate them we both can and should. But if to place supine acquiescence above resistance however hopeless, and to count a mute and inglorious fatalism 'greater' than valour in a lost cause is revolting, neither does Demosthenes display that sympathetic imagination which characterises the great man in his dealings with his fellows, nor yet that instinct to mould out of the living present a future organically developed from the past. Such a task requires not merely imitative ability but creative genius, and Demosthenes, in this respect, proved himself no greater, if no less, than his age, and in the judgment now before us this important fact is barely recognised.

But further, Demosthenes, immersed in the past and the present, lacked the genius to transcend either, and rarely rose superior to the out-worn artifices of 'friendships bought dearly and honour cheaply sold' and, in brief, of all the restless, shifty, petty, selfish and self-centred politics of Greece.

Finally, there is his lack of insight into and sympathy with the deeper feelings of the Athenian people; and this is the real cause of that insecurity of hold upon them, resulting in an intermittent political impotence which is only partly due to his wider political miscalculations: for, though we may pardon the presumption which ventured to believe the men of his day capable of the virtues and achievements of simpler and sterner days, what fatal blunder was that which dared to save Athens by a Theban alliance, to taint the purest

and deepest springs of national pride and loyalty with 'Persian gold,' while rejecting the humbler but more honourable rôle of an alliance with Philip against the barbarian? Truly, Demosthenes was too dull to be successfully mean and too mean to be triumphantly great. The cause lay in his personal character. The best biography of Demosthenes is his statue. There the defects of his public and private life—for they are analogous—lie revealed: passion without sympathy; intellect without humanity; a will arid because rootedly abstract; a fire ineffectual because overmasteringly fierce. It is no mere accident that Cicero has been likened to Demosthenes. Orators and lawyers both, fed on precedent and swollen with rhetoric, prone to assimilate rather than to understand, Demosthenes and Cicero, by reason of their fundamental non-comprehension of human nature, their egoism, their utter lack of humour, fabricated from the past a political chimaera having no relation to the possibilities of their political and social environment. Of this fetish enthroned they were the respective and self-ordained high-priests; its existence they identified, rightly, with their own; in its glory they felt their own weakness transfigured; its praises they sang with language matchlessly futile, and its cult they prosecuted with the pathos of vindictive fanaticism. By it and their own feelings about it they judged all things; and with it they perished miserably. Much, therefore, as we admire the author's able and courageous efforts to uphold his hero, the defence of Demosthenes, as a politician, we think, is a task as futile as the policy of Demosthenes himself.

For the rest, the book, with its discussion of democracy and imperialism; its allusions to the working in an ancient democracy of rhetoric—which, as we are reminded, has its modern counterpart in journalism; with its presentation of a free and humanly-civilised state confronted with a portentous and semi-barbarous but highly-organised and efficient military power of approved 'diplomatic skill' aiming at an universal tyranny, though well aware that while

freedom and democracy live its hold is insecure; and finally, with its portrayal of the slow and melancholy degeneration of the common weal into the control of lawyer minds, lawyer politicians and into lawyer pockets—all this gives the book a curiously modern ring and makes it extraordinarily interesting at the present time. Indeed, it is from illuminating works like these, if rightly used, that we can frame such a forecast—not necessarily a pessimistic one—of the evolution and

destiny of modern states as is based not on those differences between the ancient and the modern world which are so often and so mistakenly proclaimed as fundamental, but on their far more fundamental and therefore more potent spiritual identity.

The extracts from the speeches are well chosen, and the book, besides being most readable from cover to cover, is splendidly illustrated with photographs, reproductions of drawings, and maps.

O. H. T. RISCHBIETH.

HERODOTUS AND HIS WORK.

Herodotos : Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie. Vol. VIII., Supplement, 2tes Heft. By F. JACOBY. 1913.

THE article on Herodotus in the new edition of the great German Real-Encyclopädie has been eagerly anticipated by students of Greek history. Now that it has arrived, they certainly cannot complain that inadequate space has been allowed for the subject: 315 columns of 68 lines each would make a goodly enough volume, even though the lines are only about three-quarters the length of those in an ordinary octavo.

Whether it is a good plan to publish elaborate studies in an encyclopaedia might be a matter of question; it seems hard that the student of Herodotus should have to buy with Jacoby's article an equally long account of the various members of the Herod family. But usage has now sanctioned these elaborate articles.

A complaint may, however, be urged against the form in which the present article is presented. There is the scantiest bibliography—only half a column—at the end; all the other references are incorporated in the text. The student thus misses the advantage of a general conspectus of the literature; and, as all references after the first give only the name of the author and the page, the reader, if he overlook the first mention of the special treatise, has to search back to find out to what book subsequent references are made. And the custom

of putting all references in the text (instead of in footnotes) makes the articles in the new Pauly somewhat difficult reading; the parentheses are as long as they are frequent, and the brackets that enclose them are very inconspicuous.

But to turn to the contents of the article. Considering its length, it is disappointing to find how many aspects of Herodotus are not dealt with. There is not a line about his importance as an anthropologist, a subject on which the literature is abundant and rapidly increasing. Even more surprising, though less important, is the omission (pp. 262-3) of any indication how far Herodotus' account of Babylon has stood the test of the recent German excavations; this is all the more to be regretted as Jacoby's estimate of 'the travels' is on the whole excellent (p. 247 *seq.*), and Baumstark's article on 'Babylon' in Pauly, Vol. II., is of necessity largely out of date.

The widely held theory that Herodotus had been a merchant and had travelled in this capacity is dismissed with the remark (p. 248), 'Irgend welche Kaufmännische Züge zeigt H., dem das Rechnen stets Schwierigkeiten gemacht hat, nicht.' A little experience of the world would have shown Professor Jacoby that there have been many merchant kings who had as great difficulties with their addition sums as the Greek historian.

Again, the estimate of Herodotus' ob-

ligations to literary sources is treated in the most perfunctory manner. Three lines (p. 504) are all that are given to the *Persae* of Aeschylus, and two pages to all Herodotus' prose predecessors except Hecataeus. There are, however, frequent references to this writer and Herodotus' supposed obligations to him, and Professor Jacoby repeats (from Vol. VII.) at unnecessary length his own speculations on this subject.

Leaving this list of omissions, which could be indefinitely extended, let us turn to the abundant material which is given. It is refreshing to see Professor Jacoby's independence of judgment. Kirchhoff's famous hypothesis on the development of Herodotus' history is summarily dismissed as 'vielleicht das Ungeheuerlichste was philologische Pedanterie je zutage gefördert hat.' The same epithet (p. 490) is applied to Wecklein's comparison of the speeches of Herodotus and of Thucydides, which is 'einfach falsch.' 'Sicher irrtümlich' is E. Meyer's judgment on the sources of Hdt. Bk. VII. (It may be noted in passing that it is not fair to blame (p. 239), Meyer for 'explaining Herodotus' narrative of the past by the state of politics just at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.') The vigorous common-sense shown in such judgments as these is seen in many parts of Jacoby's article which are excellent—e.g., the section (§ 31) on Herodotus as a writer, where the remarks on the speeches, and on the place of the historian in the development of Greek prose, may be especially mentioned.

But it seems difficult to accept Professor Jacoby's account of the development of Herodotus' work. This theory comes over and over again in his article; it may fairly be said that a 'higher critic,' employing Professor Jacoby's own methods, would have no difficulty in showing that it had been written at very different times, and that in this way only could the repetitions be accounted for. Perhaps the best statement of the theory is in § 24 (pp. 352 f.). It may be briefly summarised as follows: Herodotus began as a traveller, intending to write, like Hecataeus, a *ἱστὴς περίπλος*; with this object he travelled in the period shortly before 445 B.C. Then

he came to Athens, where he fell under the personal influence of Pericles. He delivered 'lectures' on his travels, and on various parts of Greek History, in Athens and elsewhere. Athens and Pericles gave him a new point of view, and at the close of his life, just before the Peloponnesian War, he resolved to recombine his various *λόγοι* in one great work, which, describing the contest of Greeks and barbarians, would justify the Athenian Empire and show that it was at once well deserved and in the best interests of Greece. Jacoby does not think that Herodotus ever returned to Athens from Thuri; he maintains that death interrupted him in his work there, before he completed his history by bringing it down to the formation of the confederacy of Delos. 'That he did not recast his old lectures is shown by the frequent repetitions. . . . The distribution of the Greek *λόγοι*, so far as they concerned the history of the pre-Persian period, appears really to be merely mechanical ("Arbeit mit der Schere," p. 361).

It has long been accepted that Herodotus read publicly parts of his work. The new points in Jacoby's theory are the emphasis laid on his work as a lecturer, the assumption that his history in its present form is a recasting of old material, and the late date assigned for this recasting. The proof of the theory is a detailed analysis of the various parts of the work. It would be impossible to describe better than is done on p. 422 the complexity of Herodotean sources, but the Professor boldly essays the task.

One general criticism may first be made. The general effect of the Herodotean history will seem to most readers emphatically to contradict the 'lecture' theory. Whatever parts of it may be like, as a whole it reads quite differently from the *ἐπιδείξεις*, of which Greek audiences were so fond.

But this is a matter of impression. It may be worth while to examine in detail Jacoby's evidence for two of his points. The first is his analysis of the Lydian history; the second is his argument against the now widely held theory that the last three books were written first—a theory which, of course, is

fundamentally inconsistent with his own.

He maintains as to the Lydian history that three stages can be traced in its composition:

1. A Lydian λόγος which he composed before coming to Athens, in which he told what he knew of the history of Lydia and its natural features.

2. When he came to Greece and heard (at Delphi) much in connection with the Croesus offerings, he composed a special 'story of Croesus.'

3. When finally he began to write his present history, he put the story of Croesus first, because it suited his subject, 'the conflict of Greeks and barbarians.' But he combined with it a large section of Lydian history, and sandwiched in some large pieces of Lacedaemonian and of Athenian history, to form a connection; to make this connection he invented (p. 383) the alliance of Croesus with Lacedaemon, which is not a fact, but merely 'a literary motive.' (This last wild hypothesis he borrows from Wilamowitz.)

Now, what is the proof of all this? It may be briefly summarised as follows:

1. Herodotus begins his history with Croesus because he was 'the first barbarian we know to subdue Greeks'; but of his conquest there is only a brief account in c. 26; the intermediate chapters are occupied with the account of how Croesus' ancestor obtained the kingdom, and of the wars against the Greeks before Croesus. 'This contradiction admits of only one explanation: what we now read as the first part of the book was originally an independent story of Croesus.'

2. At the end of the Lydian history there are three separate conclusions, in cc. 91, 92, and 93-4.

It will be obvious to anyone that both these points are correct; Herodotus neither tells his story in the way we should expect at the beginning, nor does he quite know how to leave off. C. 92 has long been seen to be a fragment of evidence which Herodotus, for some reason, has failed to incorporate in his history. But these points only prove that Herodotus' idea of connection and the modern idea are different. Half a dozen other explanatory hypotheses as

probable as Jacoby's could be suggested; but neither they nor it can be proved.

With regard to the priority of Books VII.-IX., Jacoby's negative argument is largely *a priori*. 'It is impossible to understand the book if the historical basis (Grundgedanke) is the earlier' (p. 366). This will hardly convince those who see in this priority the natural order. He deals at length with the numerous arguments from details which Bauer, and after him Macan, have collected, to prove the hypothesis of early date. What he quite fails to appreciate is the cumulative effect of these; one by one they come to very little; combined they render the modern view quite probable. And Jacoby completely misunderstands Macan's strongest argument: that 'between the two groups of references (in Books VII.-IX.) there is a chronological interval of nearly thirty years. . . . The conclusion is clear. The last three books must have been composed not very long after' 457 B.C. (Macan, 1908. LIII.) Jacoby, in trying to answer this, at once proceeds to quote the reference to Pericles in Book VI., which has no bearing on the point at all, and makes the obvious remark: 'the references are to persons or events in the Persian War.' But Macan's point is the *absence* of references to events between 457 and 431, not the *presence* of references to events in the preceding period.

There is one important argument for the early date which Professor Jacoby deals with in a way that can hardly be condemned too severely. He accepts the well-known story of 'Plutarch,' quoting Diyllus, that Herodotus 'was honoured of the Athenian Senate when he read them his books,' but he rejects the form in which it comes in the chronologers—that the honour consisted of a grant of ten talents. So magnificent a sum would strongly confirm the early date of Books VI.-IX.; such a praise of Athens was well worth ten talents. But Professor Jacoby, like others before him, thinks the sum impossibly large. He is entitled to his view; but he is not entitled to quote Isocrates (*περί ἀντιδ.* 166) as saying that Pindar only received a 'thousand drachmas' for his dithyramb on Athens. Isocrates says

that Pindar received 'ten thousand drachmas' for 'a single phrase' (*ἐν ῥήματι*); all the texts give *μυρίας*; neither Bekker nor Blass (Teubner, 1879) gives any hint of a different reading, nor does the French edition of Cartelier. No doubt Professor Jacoby would say the reading was impossible. But he ought to tell his readers that he has altered the text, as he alters (quite unnecessarily) the texts of Diyllus (p. 57) as to Herodotus and Panyasis.

It must be added that his references

always need verifying; apart from the too numerous misprints, he often reads into a passage a meaning (as certain) which is neither probable nor even possible. It may be noted, as a compliment to Oxford scholarship, that he repeatedly quotes Dr. Macan's great edition (though he generally disagrees with him, as he does with most of his predecessors), and that he pronounces Hude's text in the *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* to be 'unentbehrlich,' and gives his references to it.

THE SCHOOLS OF MEDIAEVAL ENGLAND.

The Schools of Mediaeval England. By A. F. LEACH. 1 vol. Demy 8vo. Pp. xvi + 350. 43 illustrations. London: Methuen, 1915. 7s. 6d. net.

MR. A. F. LEACH, after taking part as a practical teacher in the restoration of the ancient grammar school at Northallerton, is now by his writings pursuing a similar object over a wider field. His new book upon the Schools of Mediaeval England, is a vigorous challenge hurled against some of our dearest prepossessions. Comfortable ignorance upon this topic is blown out of its entrenchments. And in fact the wounds inflicted by Mr. Leach's artillery upon many captains of learning call for the services of the ambulance.

If I indicate some of the tactical points previously held by others, but now to all appearances in Mr. Leach's effective possession, the reader will gain some idea of the general lines of Mr. Leach's offensive. I am not certain that the author's attention ought not to be called to a possible ambiguity in the last word of the previous sentence. For although he has helped to clear up a large number of current errors, he has laid himself open to attack; there is at least one point upon which in my opinion he is open to further information. This I will try to indicate in the sequel with the respect which really is owing to a work of such value.

If it is true that the grammar schools of England have contributed to the formation of that character which we rightly and with pride are admiring upon

the battlefield, it is not a matter of indifference whether or not we can ascertain some of the causes which in the Middle Ages operated towards such a result. And Mr. Leach helps to clear the ground by excluding certain factors which have no right to the esteem in which in various quarters they unwarrantably enjoy. He deprives Edward VI. (in spite of Professor Pollard's protests) of the credit of founding the grammar schools which go by the King's name, and thus removes part of the artistic contrast between the darkness of pre-Edwardian times and the full glare kindled by the politicians who surrounded the young monarch's throne. But the illumination no longer referred to this quarter does not therefore in Mr. Leach's opinion stream from the mediaeval monasteries. These, indeed, he compares to voluntary workhouses and penitentiaries, and scouts the notion that the great monasteries were homes of learning as a delusion. Here we are concerned with the early Middle Ages (53). But, the same estimate of the monasteries affects the author's judgment throughout his book. Now, although he has made it sufficiently clear that the monasteries did not found the grammar schools, for all that they played a greater part in the transmission of ancient learning than Mr. Leach is willing to allow.

I should like to set in relief a statement which occurs in the even tenor of the narrative (p. 115). 'Though the cathedral and collegiate churches were the chief, they were not the only source of schools in the eleventh and early twelfth,

any more than in later centuries. On the contrary, in every town of considerable population there was a demand for, and consequently a supply of, schools.' It is not yet recognised generally that the external splendour of the Middle Ages was paid for mainly by the towns in material and spiritual coin. And the cause of this our blindness is largely due to the attacks upon civic liberties which began under Henry VII. and matured under the two sons of Charles I. The degeneration in some respects of our mediaeval cities thus begun, proceeded more or less evenly through the eighteenth century, until the late Georgian era culminated with the discoveries of municipal jobbery and corruption by the commissioners of 1832. We look therefore through a fairly thick haze if we would see the mediaeval towns in their original light. It is difficult in face of the modern civic indifference to higher education to re-create the picture of an England with a grammar school to every six thousand inhabitants. 'The advancement of science and learning comes from a cultured middle class.' And this class arose with the towns. The Tudors and Stuarts plundered the towns and took away their privileges, and their courtiers adding insult to injury ridiculed the deficiencies of which they were the direct causes. Curiously enough, Dickens in his descriptions of Eatanswill and Ipswich in the *Pickwick Papers* maintains the literary attitude towards this decadence. Unfortunately the new centres of population in England have measured themselves by the faint shadows of civic splendour which still haunt their ancient seats, and the English nineteenth century goes down to posterity as the mother of mean streets, of mean churches, of mean towns. May I suggest to Mr. Leach that he should put the grammar schools of which he has recovered the history more into their proper context, so that Shakspeare will mark for us the sunset of English town life at its best?

I do not find sufficient reference to the education of boys (girls apparently did not exist) considered along with the intellectual and social movements of which the towns were the centre. But

this fascinating topic lies perhaps outside of the author's plan and it is ungrateful to complain when he has given us so much. At any rate, if the cathedrals and other churches served by the secular clergy provided the schools, the townspeople eagerly availed themselves of the opportunities of learning thus provided. And this fact enables us to put another topic of Mr. Leach's in its right place—I mean humanism. Mankind is usually so busy with the general purposes of life that there is little room left for liberal studies and the fine arts. The monastic orders recognising this fact shut themselves up and tried to create an artificial environment in which their own particular point of view should find satisfaction. But this satisfaction cannot be found apart from the common life. And the common life is presented once for all in the Latin classics; for these make the same appeal as Greek literature to human possibilities, an appeal less profound indeed but for that very reason more within the usual scope. Chaucer and Shakspeare, therefore, learned from the town as well as the grammar school to interpret life in a language more universal than ecclesiastical Latin.

In these strenuous times Mr. Leach seems to associate patriotism with our traditional English mispronunciation of Latin. And here it is lamentable to a grateful reader that one should have to find serious fault. It is inaccurate in the extreme to speak of the modern unreformed pronunciation of Latin as current in the time of Aelfric (p. 87). 'Even as late as 1542,' Sir John Sandys¹ assures us, 'the vowels were still pronounced at Cambridge in the Italian manner. But the Reformation made it no longer necessary for the clergy to use the common language of the Roman Church; and partly to save trouble to teachers and learners Latin was gradually mispronounced as English.' I have transplanted this valuable section into my own commentary, because Sir John Sandys has only revealed a fraction of the truth. What was the other fraction of the purpose with which Latin was mispronounced? There is evi-

¹ *History of Classical Scholarship*, II. 233.

dence upon which, after long search, I cannot again put my hand that the Westminster boys (who were to take the lead of English schools in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) were specially instructed in the mispronunciation of Latin, in order that they might neither understand nor take part in the Roman service. I believe that the present distinguished headmaster still maintains this tradition. But patriotism of this subtle kind was not confined to Westminster. Lichfield Grammar School trained Dr. Johnson, and this sound Englishman, when he was presented to a Frenchman of great distinction, would not 'deign to speak French, but talked Latin, though his Excellency did not understand it, owing perhaps to Johnson's English pronunciation.' Mr. Leach may well be confident relying upon such predecessors, but I cannot congratulate him upon his contribution to the subject (p. 88). When boys 'patter their pater,' it is probable according to my colleague Professor Weekley, in his *Romance of Words*,¹ that 'patter is for paternoster,' so that the very weapon

used by the author to rout the innovators proves their prescriptive right to the field in question. In fact, our English vowel scale closely resembled the Italian down to the middle of the sixteenth century. On this whole matter of Latin pronunciation Mr. Leach is deplorably mistaken.

But we must not allow this fault to blind us to the great services which he has done to English education by publishing this history. He has laid the foundation for many profitable enquiries which can be pursued in living contact with facts. The thoughtful person is no longer tempted in this field at least to imitate his professed model and lift himself up above the ground in the philosophical basket in order to walk in air and contemplate the sun's brilliance. Mr. Leach has lit some street lamps in the mediaeval night, and we may yet construct a serviceable map of the place. To conclude on a note of agreement, Latin instruction in the towns of England shared in their general intense life, and was therefore by the oral method.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

THE ACHARNIANS OF ARISTOPHANES.

The Acharnians of Aristophanes. Edited from the MSS. and other original sources by RICHARD THOMAS ELLIOTT, M.A. 8vo. Pp. xliii+241. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 14s. net.

WHEN Mr. Elliott announced, seven years ago, that he had completed full collations of all the MSS. of the *Acharnians*, that play was still suffering from the want of a good English edition. Since then we have been given full-dress editions by Mr. Starkie and Mr. Rogers, and a useful commentary by Mr. Rennie, and in 1907 Mr. Cary had already published, in *Harvard Studies*, a careful examination of the MSS. of this play which to some considerable extent anticipates the purpose of Mr. Elliott's volume. To sum up the contents of this edition, it contains a brief résumé of the author's conclusions as to the MSS., a text with

testimonia and extremely full apparatus, a series of notes, mainly textual, at the end, and three appendices.

With regard to the MSS., Mr. Elliott's conclusions agree in all but slight detail with those of Mr. Cary, and the relations of the fourteen MSS. may now be regarded as settled, at any rate so far as concerns the *Acharnians*. The evidence on which Mr. Cary relied Mr. Elliott has checked, corrected here and there, amplified by references to *lemmata* and citations, and placed before us *in extenso*.² It is as a full statement of the facts that this text is chiefly valuable, for the immediate profit to the text of the *Acharnians* is, it must be said, small. Mr. Elliott's apparatus

² His apparatus includes full collations for considerable portions of the play even of Δ, Vb1, M9, E2, which are direct copies of extant MSS.

¹ P. 69.

shows indeed that the MSS. of Aristophanes have in the past been collated with a carelessness which I can only hope is unusual, but the actual damage to the text has been slight. We shall read, for example, δέ for γάρ at 73 on a better report of R, but at the *cruces* we shall continue to read what we will for all the help the new collations give us.

Mr. Elliott's own text is extremely conservative, and his additional notes are full of criticism of metrical and grammatical canons which have served as a basis for emendation. Much of this criticism is in detail sensible and just (though I think Prof. J. W. White's full statement of the evidence makes some of the metrical polemic unnecessary); the tone in which it is couched, however, seems to me unfortunate. Mr. Elliott is not himself consistent, for at 590 he yields to Dawes and reads *τεθνήξευς*, and at 611 alters *καίτοι γε* in deference to Porson, but as a general rule he is extremely contemptuous of such 'unproved hypotheses.' And at 924, where he reads *αἴφνης* with Bothe, I cannot but suspect that the decisive merit of this emendation is that it has been called un-Attic. 'The mere fact that the simple form is not found elsewhere in the scanty remains of classical literature, except in a very doubtful passage of Euripides (*I.A.* 1581),' says Mr. Elliott, quoting Mr. Rogers, 'is absolutely unimportant when we consider the frequent occurrence not only of *ἐξαίφνης*, but also of *αἴφνιδιος* and *ἄφνω*'; and he has not paused to consider that he is arguing against, not for, *αἴφνης*. If *ἐξαίφνης* and *αἴφνης* are identical in sense, and *αἴφνης* never occurs, then my reluctance to introduce it will increase in exact proportion to the frequency with which I meet *ἐξαίφνης*. 'I doubt the logic,' says Mr. Elliott (*à propos* on this occasion of Cobet's *ἑννιέθ'* at 101), 'of forming a theory and then assuming that part of the evidence must be spurious if it does not support the theory.' It may not be logical, but it is the way such theories as Porson's cretic law come into an existence which few would deny to be justified. Where MSS. are your chief or only evidence for metrical and grammatical forms, the path of criticism

necessarily includes circles of this kind, and critics will sometimes tread on their own tails. Good critics will do so less frequently than bad, because they tread more delicately, but the risk can be wholly avoided only by an inglorious determination to stand still.

Of his own emendations Mr. Elliott prints seven in the text; and here, I think, he has been too partial, for, with the exception of *κούρι* at 731 (already proposed on other grounds by Mr. Starkie), I do not much expect to see any of them in that proud position again.¹ As a rule, however, he is extremely shy of conjectures, and maintains, truly enough, that Aristophanes has been the subject of much indiscreet alteration. Indiscretion, however, is possible in defence as well as attack, and I do not think (for example) that Lamachus's blow on the head can be usefully employed to explain the nonsense he is made to talk at 1185. Still, as a rule, Mr. Elliott's defences, though they often leave me unconvinced, are sensible and relevant. On the other hand, his edition would be much more useful to students of the *Acharnians* if he had added an appendix of conjectures after the fashion of Wecklein's *Aeschylus*. For just as he often defends the text where it has been attacked, so he is often silent as to the attack where he thinks no defence is needed. 'Ἐλθόντες, for example, at 25, might be the object of universal admiration for all we are here told to the contrary.

Of the three appendices, the second, which contains a transcript of the papyrus fragments of the play, calls for no comment. The first is an elaborate investigation of Athenaeus's text of Aristophanes, from which it appears that his tradition does not coincide with any branch of ours, and that where our MSS. differ he is usually (like Suidas) on the side of the angels. Mr. Elliott seems to me, however, to exaggerate the importance of Athenaeus's evidence for the text. Athenaeus has preserved a good many words in lines quoted expressly for the word (e.g. *κοτυλίσκιον*

¹ At 611 *καίτοι ἐστίν γε* is conceivably right; but Elmsley's *καί τοῦστί γε* and Blaydes's *καί τοῦστί γε* leave little to Mr. Elliott, and even to that little Mr. Starkie has a prior claim.

at *Ach.* 459), but apart from such express citation the only plausible reading due to him alone seems to be *θερμόν* at *Vesp.* 330,¹ and the list of his agreements in good readings with one or other group of MSS. presents no very imposing testimony to his integrity. It is noticeable that the emendations which Mr. Elliott tries and condemns by the evidence of what he calls the 'undesigned coincidence' of Athenaeus and the MSS. are almost without exception unacceptable on other grounds. Still, if I wished to read with Bentley *ἵππος* at *Plut.* 815, I should not be much deterred by Athenaeus's disapproval. Mr. Elliott himself is a little inconsistent, for at 475 he prints an emendation which ignores Suidas's express testimony to the word *φιλάτιον*, though elsewhere he attaches great importance even to such late evidence, and is sufficiently patient of eccentric forms to defend *ἐντετυτλανωμένης* at 894.

The third appendix, which contains an investigation of the dialect scenes in Aristophanes, is in some ways the most valuable part of the book, though the results show that editors may well despair. Aristophanes is inconsistent (*Ach.* 746 is the most striking example) and, judged by inscriptional evidence, inaccurate, and of course his scribes Atticise. So when, to take a simple instance, Megarian inscriptions have

¹ *Nais* at *Plut.* 179 is an emendation.

both *ει* and *αι*, Aristophanes consistently *αι*, but at 742 *είπερ*, the choice between *είπερ* and Elmsley's *αιπερ* can hardly be decided by reason.² But, at any rate, this appendix contains a full and impartial digest of all the materials, and will be indispensable to all students of the dialect plays.

As I have in this notice criticised mainly certain judgments of Mr. Elliott, it is only fair to say that the importance of the book lies not in his judgments, but in the store of facts he has collected. Scholars will not, I think, always agree with Mr. Elliott, but they will not be the less grateful on that account for the years of patient and laborious work which have obviously gone to the making of his edition. The immediate results seem to me, and I think must have seemed to Mr. Elliott, disappointing, but the information here gathered together will in various ways be of value to students of this and other plays, and when the problem of the Aristophanic MSS. is finally solved Mr. Elliott will not be without his share in the credit.

A. S. F. GOW.

² The question is in certain cases complicated by a doubt as to how Aristophanes represented the sounds; but speculation on this head does not seem very profitable in the present state of our knowledge. On p. 163 Mr. Elliott says Aristophanes' autograph 'would probably have been in the Ionic alphabet'; on the next page he seems to imply that it was in the Attic.

GREEK AND ROMAN SACRIFICE.

Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer. By VON S. EITREM. Pp. 493. Kristiania: Utgit för H. A. Bennechts Fond, bei Jacob Dybwad.

THE main argument of this book suggests that the normal preliminaries of Greek and Roman sacrifice are the 'fossilised' survival of a ritual older than the gods, and older than the sacrifice of animals to the gods; that this ritual is itself, in origin, a sacrifice, not, as Stengel thought, to Gaia, but to the dead. The author examines each detail of the preliminary rite, and shows how each has its place in the ancient

cult of the dead. That cult passed into the cult of heroes, and of chthonic powers, and finally of Olympian gods: traces of it survive in the Olympian ritual as in magic and mystery.

To this general argument, I suppose, few scholars will object. But I imagine that the methodical and rather pedestrian treatment, though to the present reviewer it gives confidence, will seem, to learned and imaginative followers of Dieterich and other hierophants of protobarbaranthropology, to omit all that really matters. In defence of Eitrem's method it may be said that we know,

without question, that the worship of the dead played an important part in the primitive religion of Greece, whereas the evidence for the 'Eniautos-Daimon,' for Kouros-worship, and even for Dieterich's universal Gaia-cult, at any rate in Greece, is, at least, inadequate. Eitrem explains too much by reference to the cult of the dead. He seems to imply that there was a time when that particular department of superstition alone mattered. Is it not more probable that, from the earliest times, life was made complicated, not only by the dead, but also by all manner of magical powers and dangers? Still, the worship of the dead played so important a part in the development of religion that I prefer the exclusiveness of Eitrem to the vague, if stimulating, lavishness of *Themis*. The advantages of Eitrem's method may be illustrated by his insistence that the pouring of water must be explained on the same lines as similar ritual use of milk, blood, honey, etc. (p. 100), so that we must not talk, with Jevons, of the 'water-spirit'; by his rejection of Usener's suggestion that honey is given to the 'blessed' dead because honey is the food of the gods (p. 107), and by his admission that water is used by the dead for washing as well as for drinking (p. 118), however much the Theophrastus may incline to Loewe's gratuitous conjecture *aqua quae mortuis libatur* for *qua mortuus lavatur*. Turn to his treatment of the *καταχύσματα* (e.g. p. 266) and the kindred throwing of stones (p. 284), and I think you will feel more comfortable than you generally feel when you read of such strange matters. And, in general, the use of literary evidence—though the distinction between early and late, Greek and barbarian, might be more clearly indicated—is more sober, and therefore more suggestive, than, for example, that of a recent writer on the origin of Comedy. It is unlikely, I think, that Xenophon, when he laid aside his garland on the receipt of bad news, did so because death 'breaks the protective power of garland as of ring,' and not rather because he felt that garlands were unsuitable for a moment of sorrow (p. 69). It is perverse to

suggest that ἀνηφαίστω πυρί in Eur. *Or.* 614, has anything to do with the superstition that it is a bad omen if sacrifices refuse to burn (p. 137). The fact that Demos is boiled to youth by the sausage-seller is *not*, though the myth of Medea is, evidence for the superstition that hot-water has magical powers (p. 191). Still, slips like these are exceptional, and there is nothing here which approaches the fantastic imagination of those who will not allow Medea to outwit Jason or recoil from her crime without the excuse of an original ritual *Agon*,¹ and who forbid Demos to be cooked, Philocleon to faint, victors to be crowned, or Aristophanic characters to throw stones or behave obscenely, unless they have the excuse that the poet had to follow the outlines of an 'original sacred drama,' with human sacrifice, and a ritual contest, and *ἱερὸς γάμος* as well.² From this kind of fancy Eitrem's sober method is a welcome relief. In the difficult matter of the interpretation of vase-paintings (e.g. p. 10 and p. 168) he is not always cautious.

A book of this kind, made up of a great mass of evidence, naturally contains many suggestions which interest a student of literature. I will mention a few:—ἀμφίπολον Pind. *Ol.* I. 93 is applied to the tomb of Pelops because the worshipper *went round it* ceremonially, not, as the scholiast says, to admire (p. 10); Eur. *El.* 803, the queen prepares the barley, as the wife probably did in the ancient family worship (p. 294); *Eum.* 371, the dances of the Furies are ἐπιφθονοὶ because they move from right to left to bind the victim (p. 45); Suet. *Vitell.* 2, *capite velato circumvertensque se, deinde procumbens*, a combination of the old Roman act of worship with the oriental προσκύνησις (p. 48); Soph. *O. C.* 489, whispering, so that only the ghosts can hear (p. 124); *Od.* iv. 759, not a truncated sacrifice, but a complete, old-fashioned rite, prayer with offering of grain (p. 277); Ar. *Pax* 1,074, an excellent jest, as van Leuwen shows,

¹ See Professor Murray in *Themis*, p. 354. The argument is characteristic.

² See Mr. Cornford's *Origin of Attic Comedy*.

because salt is used medicinally for madness (p. 325).

It would have made the task of reading and of reviewing easier if the author had always provided as clear a summary of his conclusions as that with

which he has ended his illuminating account of magic circles and garlands and rings.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

THE *ALCESTIS* OF EURIPIDES.

The Alcestis of Euripides, translated into English Rhyming Verse, with Explanatory Notes, by Professor GILBERT MURRAY. London: George Allen and Unwin. 1s. net; cloth, 2s. net.

In this new rendering of the *Alcestis* Professor Gilbert Murray has given us a fresh example of his admirable method of translation. When he sits down to translate Greek tragedy he does not ask himself, 'Is this in the tragic style?' but, 'Will this convey to an English audience what Euripides meant to convey to the Athenians?' In the *Bacchae*, by using modern religious phraseology, he tries to make us realise something of the religious feeling of the Greeks; so here, wishing to make us see how Euripides presented the grief of a child at the loss of its mother, he gives us—

Mummy has gone away
And left me and will not come back any more.

* * * * *

Such a little time we had her. She might
have stayed
On till we all were old. . . .
Everything is spoiled when Mother is dead.

Some critics will object that this is not the language of poetry. But then that is what they said about Wordsworth.

The choruses hardly afford the translator the same opportunity for lyric verse as the choruses of the *Bacchae*; but some of the charm of

'Will they ever come to me, ever again?'

of the *Bacchae* is to be found in the following stanzas:

Chorus.

Oh, a House that loves the stranger,
And a House for ever free!
And Apollo, the Song-changer,
Was a herdsman in thy fee;

Yea, a-piping he was found
Where the upward valleys wound,
To the kine from out the manger
And the sheep from off the lea,
And love was upon Othrys at the sound.

And from deep glens unbeholden
Of the forest to his song
There came lynxes streaky-golden.
There came lions in a throng,
Tawny-coated, ruddy-eyed,
To that piper in his pride;
And shy fawns he would embolden
Dappled dancers, out along
The shadow by the pine-tree's side.

In the longer speeches there is much fine writing, and all the dignity with which Admetus can be invested is expressed in the stately lines beginning:

I called not thee to burial of my dead.

In the Preface is much fresh suggestion, even in regard to this much-commented-on Play. But then, as Professor Murray says of Dr. Verrall, his 'work, as always, stands apart. Even if wrong, it has its own excellence.' He devotes some space to maintaining that *Alcestis* is 'not by any means a mere blameless ideal heroine. . . . Where he (Admetus) is passionate and romantic, she is simple and homely. . . . When Admetus has made a thrilling answer about eternal sorrow, and the silencing of lyre and lute, and the statue who shall be his only bride, *Alcestis* earnestly calls the attention of witnesses to the fact that he has sworn not to marry again.' Is not Professor Murray from the Greek point of view a little 'wrong' here? Surely her simplicity and homeliness are just what the average Greek husband held to be 'ideal' in a wife? This inability on our part to realise the shifting nature of some ideals, though not of all, very much exaggerates the difficulty critics have raised over Admetus' treatment of Heracles. Hos-

pitality is largely a question of geography; and as a virtue, even nowadays, ranks quite differently in Shetland and in South Kensington. Professor Murray's treatment of this incident in the Notes is excellent.

Of Thanatos, as presented by Euripides, Professor Murray writes with wonderful insight. We have become accustomed to think of Death and Sin as they existed in the Puritan imagination, solemn, majestic figures. Professor Murray writes: 'Thanatos is not a god, not at all a King of Terrors. One may compare him with the dancing skeleton

who is called Death in mediaeval writings.' And immediately there rises before us the mocking skeleton of the Dance of Death, and we realise that for once the mediaeval conception is nearer to the Greek than our own. The Notes contain much that is stimulating, and we go about our daily occupations, and cannot get the play out of our minds. The *Alcestis*, as another poet-translator wrote of it,

Ends nowise to my mind
In pardon of Admetos.

M. P.

THE CLARENDON PRESS TEXT OF LIVY.

Titī Livi Ab Vrbe Condita recognoverunt et adnotatione critica instruxerunt R. S. CONWAY et C. F. WALTERS, Tom. i., Libri i.-v. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo. Pp. xl+485. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1914. 4s. cloth; 3s. 6d. paper; 5s. 6d. India paper.

TWENTY or twenty-five years ago the opinion was widely held that any progress in the textual criticism of Latin classical authors lay only in the direction of emendation by trained scholars. It was assumed that all the manuscripts, or at least all the important manuscripts, were known and exactly collated, that the readings of all the important printed editions had been gathered together, and that all the emendations made by earlier scholars were accessible in some up-to-date apparatus criticus. The intervening years have brought a rude awakening, and have shown that in none of these particulars were the trusted editions really satisfactory. A more exhaustive examination of catalogues, in preference to editors' prefaces, a careful comparison of early printed editions, and a more thorough scrutiny of *adversaria* printed and unprinted, revealed that much progress was still possible in the preparation of the necessary basis for the emender's operations. It is enough to instance the conspicuous work of Mr. A. C. Clark on Cicero, Mr. C. Hosius and others on Lucan, and Mr. A. E.

Housman on Juvenal; and, as such discoveries have been due in particular to British scholarship, it is an especial pleasure to welcome another conspicuous illustration of the statement in the eagerly-awaited first volume of Livy by Professor R. S. Conway.

In the first place Professor Conway has utilised a number of manuscripts hitherto unknown or neglected, in particular one at Oxford and another at the British Museum. The Oxford MS. belongs to the eleventh century, was written in France, and was in the possession of the Jesuit Collège de Clermont at Paris till the middle of the eighteenth century, when, at the dispersal of that collection, it was bought, with many others, by the Dutch collector Meerman. At the sale of his books at the Hague in 1824 it was purchased, along with the ancient MS. of Jerome's Chronicle and other MSS., by Professor Gaisford for the Bodleian Library. The British Museum Harley MS. dates from the thirteenth or fourteenth century, and came from Agen in the south of France. Dr. Conway, in the second place, has revised the reports of scholars like Alschefski and Frigell on other MSS. For example, the celebrated Medicean MS. itself has demanded an exact scrutiny in many passages, particularly where erasure has occurred. Many other errors, too, have received decent interment at his hands. We are, further, deeply indebted to him for the

knowledge that we now possess of the manuscripts at Bamberg,¹ Einsiedeln and Florence (Dominican).

It was no light task and no trifling service to have collected all this valuable material, but the arrangement of the readings of ten manuscripts in an apparatus was a still more exacting piece of work. In view of the *lacunae* in the manuscripts, Professor Conway has thought it advisable to name the manuscript authorities individually for each reading given in the apparatus. Perhaps it would have been a better plan if he had indicated in the margin of the apparatus, after the fashion of the Vienna editions of the Latin Fathers, what manuscripts were lacking at particular points. Then the apparatus could have been restricted to the mention of rejected variants, and the student would have more readily grasped the relationship of one MS. to another.

The result of all this labour and thought is of course absolutely to antiquate every preceding edition. They are all at best pieces of patchwork of varying quality, while this is the result of true and thorough scientific method. I will not occupy the brief space at my disposal by considering the text of particular passages, but will merely allude to the matter of orthography, because the treatment of this shows perhaps best of all the thoroughness of the editor's work (cf. I. 12 § 1 n, III. 47 § 7 n). When the last volume is published, it ought to be provided with an 'index orthographicus.' I have read every word of the apparatus in the endeavour to fix the palaeographical

character of the various archetypes behind our surviving MSS. One fact alone has emerged with absolute certainty, and that is that 'insular' copies lie behind many of our MSS. In I. 24 § 7 *tú* is an accented *tu*, such accented monosyllables as *o* being a feature of insular MSS. adopted occasionally by others; in I. 39 § 1 *đ* is probably rather *deest*; in I. 41 § 1 *eiðcit* (cf. praef. p. xxxiv) is treated with too great respect, being merely a very frequent Merovingian spelling which has descended to later MSS.; in I. 44 § 3 *it* may very well be *item*; in I. 50 § 7 *facinerosus*, as the better spelling, should have been read (cf. II. 1 § 5 *pignera*); in II. 17 § 4 the corruption of all MSS. is probably due to an original in the 'Corbie' script (cf. 20 § 9); in II. 53 § 6 the explanation of the reading *perpeti* does not seem to me palaeographically possible; in III. 51 § 7 the scribe of *F* certainly meant *quieuit*, to which parallels are not infrequent; in III. 59 § 3 *uetera* must first have been corrupted to *utra* (cf. Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, p. 225). In the preface, p. vii, n. 3, l. 2, for 'codicum' read 'codices' (so. p. ix, l. 3 from foot, p. xxxv, l. 17); p. xii, l. 9, 'Vrbi' for 'Vrbis'); § 12, the autograph of Rhenanus is possibly still preserved in his library at Schlettstadt; p. xxii, l. 4, read 'Claromontano'; p. xxv, at the top, the errors seem explicable without resort to the theory of dictation, which Madvig was doubtless too hasty in excluding absolutely; p. xxxii, l. 3, and elsewhere, read rather *Aginnensis* or *Agennensis* (see the *Thesaurus* s. v.): in the apparatus at V. 7 § 7 read *finitus*, and at V. 18 § 1 for *Stadtr.* read *Staatsr.*

A. SOUTER.

University, Aberdeen.

¹ Collated by the lamented A. H. Kyd, of Wadham College and Manchester University, who would have rendered yet greater services to scholarship if he had lived.

SHORT NOTICES

The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army. By G. L. CHEESMAN. 8vo. Pp. 192. 1 plate. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 5s. net.

I MUST begin this notice with the confession that I read most of Mr. Chees-

man's volume in proof and that he has made friendly allusion to me in his preface. Nevertheless I do not think that I shall be suspected of log-rolling if I praise what everyone will recognise as a most excellent and also as a most useful book. Its merits are indeed

many. It is a comprehensive review of one half of the Roman army, which is alike up-to-date, complete, brief, and lucid, and is written with sound historical insight. The auxilia are important to all classical students. They are repeatedly mentioned in ancient literature; no one can read much of any Roman historical writer—Caesar, Tacitus, or anyone else—without encountering many references to Roman auxiliary regiments and needing to understand them if he is properly to appreciate his text. Yet no good and full account of the auxilia exists in English. Mr. Stuart-Jones, in his *Companion to Roman History*, gives indeed a capital chapter on 'War,' but he does not deal with the matter of Mr. Cheesman's book. Even the two admirable monographs on the Roman *Alae* and *Cohortes* (which made up the chief auxilia) which Cichorius contributed to the first and fourth volumes of *Pauly-Wissowa* are more of an army list than an account of the principles and growth—as well as the details—of the Roman Auxilia, and one of the articles is now twenty and the other fifteen years old. Few books fill a real gap so really well as Mr. Cheesman's volume. Moreover, in modest and incidental fashion, he introduces much new matter, so that he not only codifies but carries forward our knowledge of the Roman army. It is not very easy to indicate these advances in detail without occupying more space than might seem justifiable. But every reader of the book will notice that the author has formed his own opinion, alike on many details and on various general matters treated by previous writers, and that while (as he states in his preface) he has found little cause to leave the path indicated by Mommsen thirty years ago, he has followed it with independence and judgment and has attained good original results. I may cite one instance of somewhat general interest, the good or evil of the 'celibacy' of the Roman soldier (pp. 118 ff.). Seeck's arguments on this matter, first set out in the *Rheinisches Museum* and since summarised in his *Untergang*, are not only refuted, but there emerges a truer statement than I have seen elsewhere of the actual position in the Roman army.

Again, the army lists, if one may so call them, in the two appendices, contain a fuller conspectus of the Auxilia in respect of distribution and composition than any scholar has yet put together, and the concluding note on the *cohortes voluntariorum* adds to its value. If, as Mr. Cheesman says, Mommsen laid very well the foundations of our knowledge of the Roman Imperial army, if progress does not here lie through the bouleversement of received opinions, there was still room for advance and this book has filled a good deal of it.

Let me add that the volume may well interest a wider circle than professed scholars or historians. It is written by one who has long known of military things, and it is plain that as he wrote his book the conditions and problems of modern armies were always in his mind.

[NOTE.—This review was written some time ago, before Mr. Cheesman went out to fight and die. I have left it as it was. For the rest, see p. 222.]

F. HAVERFIELD.

Aus Platos Werdezeit. By MAX POHLENZ. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 427. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 10.

HERR POHLENZ has given us an interesting study of the intellectual development of Plato in his earlier years. The treatise is based throughout on a painstaking investigation of the dialogues, and bears evidence of wide reading in connection with the subject.

An examination of the purely Socratic dialogues brings Herr Pohlenz to the conclusion that none of them can have been written before the death of Socrates, seeing that the *Apology*, *Laches*, and *Charmides* were evidently meant to be a justification of his character and methods, while the *Hippias Minor* must, by reason of many allusions, be subsequent to these three dialogues, and the *Protagoras* similarly presupposes the existence of the *Hippias Minor*.

These Socratic dialogues give only hints of a positive answer to the question, 'What is Virtue?'—but in the *Gorgias* and the *Meno* Herr Pohlenz sees a deliberate grappling with the problem

of conduct and the dawning of a conviction that knowledge of the Good is possible through an *a priori* comprehension of the Ideas. In the *Gorgias*, and especially in the *Republic*, the conclusion is reached that political virtue can be practised by citizens only when the statesman regulates their lives in accordance with the Idea of Good.

In his later chapters the author analyses the *Menexenus* (which he regards as certainly authentic), the *Phaedo*, the *Phaedrus*, the *Lysis*, and the *Symposium*. In the *Phaedo* the Theory of Ideas, which was introduced in the *Meno* in order to explain the possibility of knowledge, finds further support as a necessary complement to the doctrine of immortality. The *Phaedrus*, *Lysis*, and *Symposium* show that reminiscence of the Ideas depends upon Eros, upon a divine *μῆνις*, that begins with admiration of sensible beauty, but finally rouses the soul to a desire of contemplating the Good. Eros is the mediator between the Sensible and the Ideal.

To turn to some minor points, Herr Pohlenz throws out the interesting suggestion that the introductory narrative (*Ich-Erzählung*), in dialogues like the *Parmenides* and the *Symposium*, which has hitherto been regarded as chiefly an artistic device to supply the reader with a proper temporal perspective, may have served as a form of dedication. In these dialogues Plato brings into special prominence the personality of the narrator, who is thereby offered a friendly compliment similar to that rendered in more modern times by a formal dedication. As regards the question of the historical verisimilitude of the Platonic Socrates—a thesis upheld by Ivo Bruns, and more recently by Professor Burnet—we find in this volume a well-reasoned argument in favour of the more orthodox view, that the Socratic discussions represent Plato's own mental questionings rather than the sentiments of the real Socrates.

Herr Pohlenz, following the tradition of Aulus Gellius and the work of Usener and Rohde, considers that the present form of the *Republic* is a second edition, and that the political discussion, recapitulated at the beginning of the *Timaueus*, refers to an earlier and less metaphysical treatise. The difficulty of

making Plato allude to an earlier rather than a later version of the *Republic*, is overcome by the supposition that after his second Sicilian journey he found it useful to fall back on his first practical version as the first member of a tetralogy comprising the *Republic*, *Timaueus*, *Critias* and *Hermocrates*. There is no inherent objection to this supposition, but the introductory dialogue of the *Timaueus* might quite conceivably be a summary of our present *Republic*, modified for the purposes of the dialogue.

Apart from points like this, there is little in the volume that is likely to raise much controversy. The author has given a very satisfactory sketch of the early development of Platonic theory.

MARIE V. WILLIAMS.

Huguenot College, Wellington, Cape Colony.

ON ISIDORE, VIII. xi. § 83.

REFERRING to Sir J. E. Sandys' note on pp. 139, 140 of vol. xxix. of this *Review*, as to the words 'villosus est (sc. Pan), quia tellus convestita est agitentibus,' I suggest that 'agitventibus' is a corruption of 'leguminibus' (i.e. 'leguminous plants'). *u* = *ii*, *m* = *ue*, *in* = *nt*; and, if the upstroke of *l* had been merged in the downstroke of a letter above it, *le* might have looked like *a* (open).

SAMUEL ALLEN.

NEW EDITION OF BURY'S GREECE.

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY. Second edition. Pp. 909. 1913. 8s. 6d.

FOR the new edition Professor Bury has re-written the greater part of Chapter I. The researches of Professor Ridgeway and Dr. Leaf and the discoveries of Sir Arthur Evans and others in Crete have rendered this necessary, and have further led him to abandon the belief that previous to the Achæan invasion Greece was inhabited by a non-Greek population. He now thinks it probable that in the third millennium B.C. Greek-speaking peoples

were gradually spreading themselves through the Peloponnesus, and that the coming of the Achaeans may 'be compared, not to the Anglo-Saxon occupation of Britain, but rather to the

Norman Conquest.' A few other minor changes have been made; the accounts of the battles of Salamis and Plataea have been partly re-written.

Σ.

OBITUARIES

ALBERT THUMB.

A POSTCARD from Prof. E. Schwyzler of Zürich brought me in August the news of the death of Prof. Albert Thumb of Strassburg. He died on August 14 of a constitutional complaint which I fancy was unsuspected, although a very serious breakdown some three years ago was a warning that all was not well. From Adolf Deissmann I learn that he was only fifty. Well may my friend call for a closing of ranks among scholars who love the studies in which Thumb was so unrivalled a pioneer! But alas! German scholars who are men of goodwill must accomplish much before the Indo-germanische Gesellschaft can meet again, or lives devoted to learning join forces once more in the common pursuit of knowledge.

Thumb's range of learning and research was immense, covering well-nigh everything that came under the comprehensive heading Indo-European linguistic. But of course it was Greek in which his contribution was really memorable. The prehistoric foundations of Greek he laid bare in the researches that found systematic place in his new edition of Brugmann's masterly Grammar. The ancient Greek dialects he set forth in a concise summary that left little to be desired for accuracy and clearness. And in particular he led the way from the philological side, as Deissmann from the theological, in teaching Hellenists that the 'decadence' of Greek was richly worth studying for its own sake. To complete our knowledge of the period when Greek was the *lingua franca* of the Roman Empire, he studied deeply the patois of the modern peasant, the dialects of natural

and genuine Greek of to-day, descended directly from the *κοινή*, and capable in skilled hands of revealing many unsuspected facts about the popular language of the early Christian centuries. His extraordinary power of grasping a living idiom enabled him not only to lay hold of the Modern Greek *ὁμιλουμένη* in general, but to delineate its dialects with a sureness of touch that a native might envy. In these researches he won the enthusiastic appreciation of the Greeks, whose ethnology he studied with keen insight, and with profoundly sympathetic interest.

British scholars in Manchester and Cambridge had an opportunity of making his acquaintance in October, 1913, when he came to stay with me for a week, lecturing at the University and the Rylands Library, and proceeding to Cambridge on his way home. He knew British work thoroughly. If I may put in a personal illustration, I would recall how he went through the proofs of *Prolegomena* to a N.T. Greek Grammar, and at least twice called attention to articles in my own language which I had overlooked. The trouble he would take for the improvement of another man's work was greater than many men will bestow upon their own. His judgment was unfailing, even if his touch was somewhat heavy, as was natural in a scholar of his environment. His students were happily numerous, and drawn from other lands than his own; and we may earnestly hope that some of them will successfully take up the threads that have prematurely dropped from the master's hand. There were indications, among scanty though warm-hearted communications that reached me after the great gulf opened between us, that his view of the war was that

which is normal among his countrymen. But it is also certain that his would have been a powerful mediating influence in happier days, had he lived to see them; and British and French scholarship may mourn him as a German, while gratefully cherishing the memory of his unique services as a scholar.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

PAUL LIEBAERT.

THOUGH not killed on the field of battle, the young Belgian Abbé, Paul Liebaert, may be called a victim of the war. War was declared when he was recovering from a severe illness. With characteristic self-forgetfulness he refused to rest and laboured unceasingly, first as chaplain and almoner in his native town of Courtrai, then, when the British wounded prisoners began to arrive, in relief of their necessities. Not until his activities were stopped by the Germans did he seek and obtain permission to return to his quiet life at the Vatican Library. The loss of his private fortune gave him much anxiety about the future; but when Italy joined the Allies he determined to stay at Rome and look after the soldiers' sons. The work overtaxed his strength. He went off to hospital at Pallanza, where he has died of typhoid fever.

The son of a wealthy business man of Courtrai, he studied Palaeography at the Vatican Library under Padre Ehrle, and was put on the list of Scrittori or Assistant Librarians, on the unpaid list; so that his time was practically at his own disposal. He had the two chief requisites of the palaeographer—a good photographic camera and facilities for visiting the libraries of Europe; and with these advantages he laid such solid foundations for his life-work, that he bade fair to become a second Mabillon. Some two thousand photographs of Latin MSS., along with methodical notes of the scribes' practices, were promising material for future publications; but, apart from magazine-articles, all that he had accomplished before his death was the co-editorship of the '*Specimina Palaeographica Vaticana*.'

How far his papers admit of publication, I do not know. But it may not be out of place here to mention the chief results he had reached in his projected History of the Corbie Scriptorium, as I learned them in conversation with him last Easter. He had detected three types of minuscule favoured at different periods at Corbie. The earliest (e.g., Paris 4403A, foll. 184v sqq.; Paris 12239; Paris 13047) he called the em-type, from its peculiar form of the letter *e* when in ligature with *m* (or *n* or *r*, etc.). The second is the type seen in that famous Bible in Amiens Library, which was written during the abbacy of Maurdramnus (772-780). This Maurdramnus type, as he called it, was succeeded in the abbacy of Adelhard by the ab-type. Three valuable clues for dating and locating MSS. of c. 750—c. 815 have thus been discovered by his diligence.

Primitiæ juvenis; but enough to show how much Latin Palaeography has lost by his premature death.

W. M. LINDSAY.

LEONARD CHEESMAN.

THE Vice-Chancellor of Oxford in his October address chose out for mention three Oxford men as noteworthy among the many who have died in the war with all, or nearly all, their promise unachieved. One of these had seemed about to do good work in labour problems, one in politics; the third was G. L. Cheesman. And, indeed, the study of history has seldom lost so real an 'inheritor of unfulfilled renown.'

The tale of his life is short. He was a scholar of Winchester and (1903-7) of New College. After taking his degree, he taught for a year at Christ Church, and then returned to New College as Fellow (June, 1908). With the help of the College, he gave a year to travel in the provinces of the Roman Empire. In 1910 he began regular teaching and lecturing, and began at the same time his own work on Roman history, and in particular on Roman military history. In 1911 he gained the Arnold Prize with an essay on the Roman auxilia; he wrote

also for the *Journal of Roman Studies* and for the *Classical Review*; he took active part in Roman excavations in England, as at Corbridge and at Ribchester; he travelled, to deepen further his knowledge of the Empire; in July, 1914, he passed the final proofs of a volume on the Roman auxilia, which had grown out of the earlier essay. Then war broke out; at once he sought a commission (he had been a volunteer in old days), and was gazetted to the Tenth Hampshires. Many of us were hoping that his peculiar qualities and knowledge of languages (Serbian among them) might be used for appropriate service, but the War Office had no use for special attainments. On August 10 he fell near Suvla Bay. His age was thirty.

His powers had ripened slowly, but well. They were such as school education, even at Winchester, does not always reach; at Oxford they became clear. I well remember the first time that I saw him; he came at the end of a lecture to put a query which none but a thorough historian could have framed. Within a few years, all who knew him felt that he was first-rate—that, if he lived, he was singularly sure to do really great historical work. He united many powers—he read fast, remembered accurately what he read, kept his knowledge at his own command and con-

trolled it lightly and easily. He was practical, too; when he studied the Roman army, he compared it with other armies, and sought advice from modern men and systems. Above all, he wielded a sound and clear historical judgment; he could form original views and avoid guesswork. His one volume, on the Roman auxilia, shows his merits plainly; it will long be the leading book on its subject.

He was much more than a student. His devotion to learning was coupled with a strong personal character, with unfailing unselfishness, extraordinary width of interest, great brightness of manner; need I add, in the words of Tacitus, 'integritatem atque abstinentiam in tanto viro referre iniuria virtutum fuerit'? Of his personal friendships I do not here speak; far outside them, he was able to charm and inspire with his own keenness and life all of his pupils who were capable of intellectual development; he never failed to add to the gaiety and the good sense of those around him. We in Oxford have lost many men whose places can never be filled; no one will wish to compare them—ὄς μὲν γὰρ τις ἔπεμψεν, οἶδεν. But the loss of G. L. Cheesman is in every way heavy—to his college, to our joint educational work, to our research, to historical study.

F. HAVERFIELD.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—The commentary of *Græculus* on the epigram quoted on p. 192 of the *Classical Review* (Sept. 1915) is exhaustive and sound. I can only add one or two remarks. Every school-master knows that *τεῖξαι* is a late nineteenth-century form of *τυχεῖν*, very common at the present day. The meaning is clear: 'For it was right that they (your friends) should find you as their guide,' etc. The Latin translation bears this out. The conjecture that *ἀλαζμονέοις* comes from *ἀλάων* is tempting in view of such forms as *μείζοντος* (gen. of *μείζων*) occurring frequently at the matriculation stage; for the substitution of the middle for the active of a supposed participle would be easy. But here again the Latin points to the meaning, 'wandering' (*flectere gressus*).

Δ.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—Professor Haverfield, in his interesting note on 'Herodotus and Babylon' published in your last issue (pp. 169-170), describes Babylon as a city of some eight miles in extent on the left bank of the Euphrates, with an extension of uncertain extent on the right bank. As he rightly says, 'Such are the remains as known at present.'

He then goes on to say that Mr. How and myself, in our recent edition of Herodotus, 'decided that this could not be the Herodotean city, because it had a wall only on two sides and its river front was unprotected.'

If he will look again at our edition (I. p. 136), he will see that we were referring to something quite different. I was there writing only of Weissbach's plan (published in *Der Alte Orient*, 1904); I

said that, 'not to mention other difficulties, it represents Babylon as having no defence on the West, except the river Euphrates, which is absurd.' This plan, if he will consult Weissbach (p. 13), he will see is called 'An attempt at a reconstruction of Babylon in the time of Nebuchadnezzar.'

In spite of Weissbach's eminence as an Orientalist, it seemed (and seems) to me impossible. I may add that, besides showing two-thirds of the river front unguarded, it gives an 'inner wall' which incloses nothing. I therefore in my note gave as briefly as I could my reason for neglecting what professed to be a plan of the city based on the most modern excavation. I rejected also Oppert's great square of some sixty miles (p. 137).

It seems to me the time has not come to

plan out exactly the size of ancient Babylon. The west bank of the Euphrates has not yet been explored, and we are quite without data as to how large a part of Babylon spread over it. It is to be hoped that when this present war is over, the work will be continued by English excavators.

Meantime I am quite prepared to accept the conclusions which Professor Haverfield puts so clearly and well, as to the main city on the left bank. Only I would suggest that we cannot infer anything as to the right-bank city from the absence of palaces and temples in it. The comparison of London south of the river warns us that we may have a vast extension of dwelling-houses, with few or no outbuildings of architectural or historical interest.

J. WELLS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

** * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Ahlberg** (A. W.) *C. Sallusti Crispi Bellum Iugurthinum, recensuit A. W. A. Gotsburgi Eranos Forlay. Collectio Scriptorum Veterum Vpsaliensis.* 9" x 6". Pp. 152. 2 kr. 25 öre.
- American Philological Association** (Transactions and Proceedings of, 1914). Vol. xlv. 9" x 6". Pp. 254+cii. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1915.
- Anacker** (C.) *Some Parallels and Differences in Greek and Latin Syntax.* 6½" x 4½". Pp. 32. London: Blackie and Son, 1915. Limp cloth, 9d.
- Aristotelica.** By Herbert Richards. 7½" x 5". Pp. x+167. London: Grant Richards, Ltd., 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Church Quarterly Review.** Vol. LXXX., No. 160. Pp. 257-508.
- Classical Philology:** A Quarterly Journal devoted to Research in the Languages, Literature, History, and Life of Classical Antiquity. Vol. X., No. 3. July, 1915. Pp. 241-364.
- Dimsdale** (M. S.) *A History of Latin Literature.* 8" x 5½". Pp. x+549. London: W. Heinemann, 1915. Cloth, 6s.
- Gardner** (E. A.) *A Handbook of Greek Sculpture* (New Edition). 8" x 5½". Pp. xxxii+605. London: Macmillan and Co., 1915. Cloth, 10s.
- Harrer** (G. A.) *Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria* (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9" x 6". Pp. 94. Princeton University Press, 1915.
- Loeb Classical Library.** Apuleius, the Golden Ass (Adlington and Gaselee), pp. xxiv+608; Pliny, Letters (Melmoth and Hutchinson), 2 vols., pp. xvi+535 and viii+440; Pindar's Odes (Sandys), pp. xlx+635; Lucian (Har-
- mon), vol. ii., pp. viii+520; Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica (Evelyn White), pp. xlviii+627, 6½" x 4½". London: Heinemann, 1915. 5s. net per vol.
- Monist** (The) *A Quarterly Magazine devoted to the Philosophy of Science.* Vol. XXV., No. 3. July, 1915. Pp. 321-480.
- Morey** (C. R.) *Lost Mosaics and Frescoes of Rome.* Princeton Monographs, IV. 10½" x 8". Pp. xii+70. Oxford: University Press, 1915. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Oldfather** (W. A.) and **Canter** (H. V.) *The Defeat of Varus and the German Frontier Policy of Augustus.* 9½" x 6½". Pp. 120. Urbana: University of Illinois. 75 cents.
- Sonnenschein** (E. A.) *A First Latin Grammar for Schools.* 7½" x 5". Pp. 126. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Starkey** (C. E. F.) *Verse Translations from Classic Authors* (New Edition). 7½" x 4½". Pp. 164. Hove, Sussex: Combridge, 1915. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Storer** (E.) *Poems and Fragments of Sappho* (the Poets' Translation Series). 6½" x 4½". Pp. 12. London: The Egoist, 1915. 4d. net.
- Strong** (Mrs. A.) *Apotheosis and After Life.* 10" x 6½". Pp. xx+293. With 36 plates. London: Constable and Co., Ltd., 1915. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Theologisch Tijdschrift.** Edited by E. D. Eerdmans, Aflerding and Co. 9½" x 6". Pp. 359-426. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh, 1915.
- Todd** (O. J.) *Quo modo Aristophanes rem temporalem in fabulis suis tractaverit quaevisit O. I. T. From Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Vol. xxvi. 9" x 5½". Pp. 72.

Babylon.
not yet
out data
read over
esent war
y English

cept the
d puts so
n the left
e cannot
from the
The com-
warns us
dwelling-
architec-

LS.

e sent for

published

iod, the
(Evelyn
London :

devoted
. XXV,

escoes of
($10\frac{3}{4}'' \times 8''$.
ss, 1915.

V.) The
Frontier
p. 120.
cents.

rammar
Oxford :
d.

ns from
 $\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$.
e, 1915.

Sappho
 $4\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$.
4d. net.

er Life.
plates.
., 1915.

E. D.
6''. Pp.
esburgh,

es rem
it quae-
udies in
 $9'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$.